

public records of copyright ownership. Applications for registrations would plummet, thereby generating irreplaceable losses to the collections of the Library of Congress. The mandatory deposit system, along with public information services, would suffer. And from our own little corner of the world, we in the Congress would be denied necessary counsel from the leading federal entity on copyright law and policy.

Mr. Speaker, copyright industries constitute the largest segment of our national economy. While I both respect and admire the work of the appropriators, in this instance I believe the Congress is acting in a penny-wise but pound-foolish manner. While I support passage of the rule and the forthcoming bill, it is my hope that during the conference it is possible to restore the necessary funding for the U.S. Copyright Office.

Mr. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 173, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

YEAS—234

Abercrombie	Chenoweth-Hage	Goode
Aderholt	Coble	Goodlatte
Army	Coburn	Goodling
Bachus	Collins	Goss
Ballenger	Combust	Graham
Barr	Cooksey	Granger
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Green (WI)
Bartlett	Crane	Greenwood
Barton	Cubin	Gutknecht
Bass	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Bereuter	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Biggert	DeLay	Hayes
Bilbray	DeMint	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Blagojevich	Dickey	Herger
Bliley	Doolittle	Hill (MT)
Blunt	Dreier	Hilleary
Boehlert	Duncan	Hoeffel
Boehner	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Ehlers	Horn
Bono	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Boswell	Emerson	Houghton
Boyd	Eshoo	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Everett	Hutchinson
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Hyde
Bryant	Fletcher	Isakson
Burr	Foley	Istook
Burton	Forbes	Jenkins
Buyer	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Callahan	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Jones (NC)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kanjorski
Campbell	Gallegly	Kasich
Canady	Ganske	Kelly
Cannon	Gekas	King (NY)
Cardin	Gibbons	Kingston
Castle	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Chabot	Gillmor	Kolbe
Chambliss	Gilman	LaHood

Largent	Pastor	Shuster
Latham	Paul	Simpson
LaTourette	Pease	Sisisky
Lazio	Peterson (PA)	Skeen
Leach	Petri	Skelton
Lewis (CA)	Pickering	Smith (MI)
Lewis (KY)	Pickett	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Pitts	Smith (TX)
LoBiondo	Pombo	Souder
Lucas (OK)	Portman	Spence
Maloney (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Manzullo	Quinn	Stump
Martinez	Radanovich	Sununu
McHugh	Ramstad	Sweeney
McInnis	Regula	Talent
McIntosh	Reynolds	Tancred
McIntyre	Riley	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Rogan	Terry
McNulty	Rogers	Thornberry
Meek (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thune
Metcalfe	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Mica	Roukema	Toomey
Miller (FL)	Royce	Trafigant
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Morella	Salmon	Walden
Murtha	Sanford	Walsh
Myrick	Saxton	Wamp
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Watkins
Ney	Schaffer	Watts (OK)
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Norwood	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Shadegg	Weller
Ortiz	Shaw	Whitfield
Ose	Shays	Wicker
Oxley	Sherwood	Wilson
Packard	Shimkus	Wolf
Pascarella	Shows	Young (FL)

NAYS—173

Ackerman	Gephardt	Millender-
Allen	Gonzalez	McDonald
Andrews	Gordon	Miller, George
Baca	Green (TX)	Minge
Baird	Gutierrez	Mink
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Barcia	Hill (IN)	Moran (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Nadler
Becerra	Hinche	Napolitano
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Neal
Berkley	Holden	Oberstar
Berman	Holt	Obey
Berry	Hooley	Oliver
Bishop	Hoyer	Owens
Blumenauer	Inslee	Pallone
Boni	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Boucher	(TX)	Peterson (MN)
Brady (PA)	Jefferson	Phelps
Brown (OH)	John	Pomeroy
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Carson	Kaptur	Reyes
Clay	Kennedy	Rivers
Clayton	Kildee	Rodriguez
Clement	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Condit	Klecza	Rush
Conyers	Kucinich	Sabo
Costello	LaFalce	Sanchez
Coyne	Lampson	Sanders
Cramer	Lantos	Sandlin
Crowley	Larson	Sawyer
Danner	Lee	Schakowsky
Davis (FL)	Levin	Scott
Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Delahunt	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
DeLauro	Luther	Spratt
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Dicks	Markey	Stark
Dingell	Mascara	Stenholm
Dixon	Matsui	Strickland
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Doyle	McDermott	Tauscher
Edwards	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Etheridge	McKinney	Thompson (CA)
Evans	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Thurman
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Tierney
Frost		Turner
Gejdenson		

Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Weygand
Udall (NM)	Waxman	Woolsey
Velazquez	Weiner	Wu
Waters	Wexler	

NOT VOTING—27

Archer	Hobson	Roybal-Allard
Baker	Hunter	Tauzin
Cook	Klink	Thomas
Cummings	Kuykendall	Towns
Engel	McCollum	Vento
English	McCrery	Visclosky
Fattah	Mollohan	Wise
Filner	Porter	Wynn
Fossella	Rangel	Young (AK)

□ 1100

Messrs. MOAKLEY, UDALL of New Mexico, DOGGETT, and RAHALL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 20001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4516.

□ 1103

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present the Legislative Branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 2001. First, I want to begin by thanking the members of the Subcommittee on Legislative for their hard work in writing this bill. They include the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the vice chairman; the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), a long-time member of the subcommittee; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER); and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Then we have the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR), the ranking member, who has worked hard with the committee and myself to prepare this bill; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA); and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who are our other members of the subcommittee.

I also want to thank the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the full committee ranking minority member for their assistance.

The bill was considered and ordered reported by the full committee on May 9. The bill was actually reported to the House May 23, 2000.

Mr. Chairman, the bill continues the program begun in the 104th Congress to right-size the legislative branch of government. We have become more efficient, with a smaller workforce, and use technology wherever we can, as long as it helps us to do our jobs better. We have done those things.

Since fiscal 1995, the last year of the other party's control of the House, we have reduced the legislative branch appropriation in real terms by a very significant amount. Had spending on legislative branch followed the old trend that we were on long before the Republican majority took over, the bill would total over \$2.2 billion, fully \$400 million higher than the bill we brought to the House today.

Together, Mr. Chairman, with my predecessor subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), we have saved the taxpayers nearly \$1.5 billion in the last 6 years, if all the Senate operations are included.

Since the early 1990s, legislative branch employment has been reduced by a full 8,217 full-time jobs. That is a reduction of 21.5 percent of our entire workforce. In comparison, the executive branch has only reduced their workforce by 10 percent, and the Judiciary has actually increased by 13.2 percent.

The fiscal year legislative branch appropriation bill totals \$1.8 billion in new obligation authority, of which \$1.1 billion is for congressional operations, exclusive of Senate items. This includes operations of the House, Congressional Budget Office, several joint items, the Architect of the Capitol, and

congressional printing. The balance of the bill, \$705 million, is for the operations of other legislative branch agencies, such as the General Accounting Office, Library of Congress, and the Superintendent of Documents.

The bill is actually \$281 million below the budget request, a 13.4 percent reduction, and is \$105 million below the current fiscal year, including the pending supplement, a 5.5 percent reduction.

Mr. Chairman, those are the general parameters of the bill. I am not going into the details because I do have an amendment. Since the bill was marked up by the subcommittee, we have worked hard to raise the 302 allocations. We have succeeded. Our new allocation has given us the ability to present to the House a bill that both saves the country money by using technology, as technology has made our entire country more efficient, it is working in the legislature, and still enable us to carry on the work of the Congress and its agencies. Consequently, I have asked the Committee on Rules to allow, and the rule does allow, a manager's amendment, which I will offer at the conclusion of debate.

This amendment has been worked out in a bipartisan manner. It reflects guidance from the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and our leadership; it incorporates several suggestions made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of our full committee; and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR). We are happy to offer this amendment.

This amendment will avoid unwise and counterproductive layoffs, will maintain capitol security, building maintenance, and research and oversight capabilities at the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office. It will provide the House with the staff, resources, and research capabilities needed to conduct our business. It will provide the necessary security to protect visitors, Members, staff and legislative activities.

There will be no need for layoffs, no need to withhold cost of living or merit increases for those who are eligible or otherwise deserve such salary adjustments. There will be no reductions in force in any of the legislative branch agencies. There will still be an overall estimated decrease of 536 FTEs. However, these staff reductions can be achieved through buyouts and attrition.

Mr. Chairman, I will defer further explanation until the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the manager's amendment. As my col-

leagues know, as we came out of the committee, the Committee on Appropriations, there were great concerns over security, maintenance of the buildings, and whether or not the supportive agencies that support this Congress were funded appropriately.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), for working on this bill, the manager's amendment, in a very bipartisan manner. The gentleman from North Carolina has involved me in all the negotiations and working on this manager's amendment, so I want to thank him for the bipartisan workmanship he has provided.

Mr. Chairman, with the additional money that has been found, we have now been able to restore in the Member's account monies that would allow the Members to give cost of living to the staff. It will ensure that the new Members and the transition costs that they will encounter will be met. It also restores money for equipment purchases in the Members' offices. And as far as Members' offices are concerned, it brings the money that is needed for personnel and equipment.

As it deals with the police, it restores all the COLAs, all the additional benefits that are needed and required, and it brings the current staff on board to 1,361. There will be no RIFs. The current class of about 96 trainees will be incorporated, and it will allow an additional class of 48 trainees. So the issue of security is addressed. And I would tell my colleagues that I think that it is restored to the level that we want.

I would like to make a comment on the police. In the past, there has been some concern over management and administration. In this bill, we have language that fences some of this money so that, hopefully, we can get the cooperation of the police board and the new chief as we solve security problems. As we are able to install more security equipment, we need to look at what other policies we can change so that we can maintain the security that is desired, at least two people at the door, but, at the same time, minimize overtime and additional personnel.

We need to work together to ensure that the Capitol and the House buildings are secured, but we need to ensure that policies are implemented that answer the problems of not only more personnel but the working relationship with the police board, the chief, and the appropriate House committees so we can ensure that we are secure but the monies are used effectively.

□ 1115

To CBO we restore funding for 215 full-time employees, and we believe that attrition will cover this and CBO is allowed discretion.

The Architect, his budget avoids RIFs and allows for next year's new

Members' transition and funds the day-time cleaning services, something we were concerned about as this bill left the committee.

CRS, very important to us. They have an accession program in place. This bill, if adopted by the manager's amendment, will restore all the CRS staff. It allows a pay increase and it will allow the accession program to continue.

There are some cuts in the GPO and also the GAO, but we are working with them to ensure that the programs that are in place would allow them to deal with this budget and be successful in providing services to the Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are supportive of the manager's amendment. We would ask our Members to support it in order that this House will continue to provide its services to its constituents.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

Part of the dialogue this morning is on the Capitol Police purchasing American-made motorcycles. We went through this some years back. In fact, they did get the use of a Harley-Davidson to use on the Capitol Grounds.

The upshot was that the officers involved in the trial period really love the new cycle. It would be equipped so they could use it for traffic stops and other type of police functions.

However, before the order actually went through, there was a row with the company and the equipment and the deal, and I think it was for eight cycles at that point, fell through. But I think it is time that we revisit the issue.

For visitors coming to the Nation's Capitol to see our Capitol Police on Kawasakis and Hondas is quite embarrassing, at least to this Member. I think that we do have American-made cycles that will fit the bill and the subcommittee; and the language that is being inserted in the bill will at least have the Chief of the Capitol Police look at it and possibly buy American and have our Capitol Police persons ride on a new, decent, operative motorcycle.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), last year during the debate on the 2000 Legislative appropriation bill, the Capitol Police were directed to look into the possibility of using American-made motorcycles in their security mission.

Is it not true that they have recently advised us of the current status of this directive?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, yes, and I have a letter from Chief Varey of the Chief of the Capitol Police received today. I include a copy of the letter for the RECORD:

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2000.

Hon. CHARLES H. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch
Appropriations, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may recall, the Conference Report for the Capitol Police Fiscal Year 2000 General Expenses appropriations contained the following language:

"With respect to vehicles, the conferees recognize the need of the Capitol Police to upgrade and possibly expand their existing fleet of motorcycles to help fulfill their security mission, and provide \$103,000 for that purpose from existing funds."

In response to this provision, the Department has surveyed the product lines of sixty motorcycle dealers and manufacturers who reportedly manufacture motorcycles in the United States which meet the specific needs of the Department's smaller sized motorcycles. As a result of this survey, only two United States manufacturers—Harley-Davidson and Buell—offer motorcycles which satisfy the Department's criteria in terms of engine size, body weight, and DOT street certification.

Following this survey, on May 12, the Capitol Police met with representatives from Harley-Davidson to discuss the Department's need to upgrade and expand its motorcycle fleet. As a result of this meeting, Harley-Davidson has agreed to provide the Department with two, smaller displacement models for testing and evaluation—the Harley-Davidson Sportster 883 and the Buell Blast 492. Arrangements are currently underway to deliver these motorcycles to the Department for its assessment.

Additionally, the Department has identified the need to upgrade its current fleet of the larger Harley-Davidson FLHTPI Electra Glide—a 1450 cc model utilized by the Department for special events, traffic enforcement and motorcades. It is the Department's intent to purchase six new Electra Glides while trading-in its three, older model Electra Glides to reduce the procurement costs of the new motorcycles and to avoid incurring unnecessary parts and maintenance expenses.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you or your staff, should you so desire, and I will be pleased to forward the results of the product test and evaluation exercise for your review and information.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. VAREY,
Chief of Police.

The Chief says that they have identified two United States manufacturers, Harley Davidson and Buell, who have motorcycles that satisfy the Department's criteria.

The Capitol Police have made arrangements to test these vehicles, and they will report the results to our committee for our review.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I first want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and ranking member of the subcommittee for having produced a bill under difficult, severe limitations and to compliment them on the manager's amendment that will be offered to solve some of the problems that were created by the first bill.

I rise at this time since the distinguished ranking member has raised the issue of the Capitol Police. We should be very proud of all of our Capitol Police officers. They are very well-trained. They are certainly dedicated to their mission here in the Capitol.

But one of the concerns that I have and the Congress has had is the fact that we could bring our Capitol Police force into a more modern age. There is technology available that would make them far more effective than they are today. Congress has provided additional funding to do this. But the previous management of the Capitol Police force, for some reason, just decided not to go ahead and move into the state-of-the-art technology.

I think that is a mistake. Just adding more people does not necessarily get the job done if we do not provide the technology that they need to do their job.

To give my colleagues an example of what I am talking about, with this bill that we will pass today, there will be 1,241 members of the Capitol Police force. This is a substantial number, but they do have a substantial obligation and responsibility.

But compare that to some other cities in the United States. Nashville Davidson, with a population of 510,000 people, has only 38 more sworn police officers than our Capitol Police force. Portland, Oregon, with 503,000 people, only has 962 sworn police officers, compared to our 1,241. Ft. Worth, Texas, with a population of 491,000, has less sworn officers than the Capitol Police force. In my area in Florida, the City of Tampa, which is an extremely large city, has only 916 sworn police officers.

These cities tend to get the job done, but most of them have taken advantage of the new technology that we have been trying to get the management of our Capitol Police to employ. And they have not done that yet.

The amendment that the managers will offer today will help improve the funding available for our Capitol Police force, and I think that is good. I am a very strong advocate and supporter of that manager's amendment. But I must say that I think, once again, we should be reminding those who administer and

manage our Capitol Police force, not the police officers themselves but those in supervisory positions, ought to take advantage of the funding that we have made available for new technology that makes the job easier for those who wear the uniform and guard this Capitol of ours.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for working through this compromise. This bill is far preferable to the original bill that was brought to the House. It meets our duty to provide for adequate police protection on the Capitol Grounds.

There are still some problems with it because it does not allow the hiring of as many Capitol Police as the Department feels necessary. But it is certainly preferable to the original bill.

I would say that there are also some other problems which need to be corrected between now and final passage of this bill. The General Accounting Office will have to impose an immediate freeze and reduce their employment level by 160 people. That is not a good idea because they are supposed to be our watchdog on financial and management affairs, and we are crippling the very agency that is charged with the responsibility to help us save taxpayers' money.

The Congressional Research Service accession plan is not funded, and I think that is a serious mistake. There are a number of other shortcomings with the funding level in the Copyright Office and some other areas.

I would be willing to support this bill if it stays in the condition that it is right now, but I will not support it if damaging amendments are attached, such as the lockbox amendment, because people need to understand how it works.

It sounds enticing to say we are going to have a lockbox and every time you cut money on the floor on an amendment that is going to go in a lockbox and is not going to be used. But under our rules, if you are considering a HUD appropriation bill and you want to cut an item in HUD so that you can put the money into another item in a different appropriation bill, such as education or defense, right now we can do that under our rules. We can cut the money on the floor and then, in conference, that money can wind up somewhere else, either in the same bill or in a different appropriation bill, or it may not be spent at all.

But under the lockbox provision, you could not cut money in one bill and expect to try to use it in another. You

would be precluded from doing that. That would make our problem in getting conference reports out in a timely fashion immeasurably more difficult and I think it would increase the likelihood that we never finish our budget work. It would increase the likelihood of more controversy and even, God forbid, Government shutdown.

So I would urge Members to recognize that sometimes what is underneath the surface is not as pretty as what it would appear to be on the surface.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, oftentimes people are relatively insensitive to the specifics of such a proposal as it might apply to legislative branch, which is this bill.

Should we pass this amendment that is being proposed today, what that does to us as we go to conference with the other body on just the legislative branch proposal puts the House at a considerable disadvantage. There are any number of issues that underlie that that we ought to be thinking about. And this is not a partisan consideration. It affects the House of Representatives. And that should be paramount in our minds.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The other problem with it is that we are assigned a specific number under the budget act, and let us say one subcommittee is given a \$3 billion allocation, and just because this House takes an action to temporarily cut that bill by \$50 million does not mean that the Senate is going to follow suit.

If the Senate has another higher level for that same bill, then when we go into conference we will have lost \$50 million that the House wants to apply to its priorities and that will make the gap between us and the Senate much larger. And I do not think we want to do that after the experiences we have had the last 2 years in trying to get appropriation bills passed in a speedy fashion.

So this amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with party. It has nothing whatsoever to do with ideology. It has everything to do with how much you understand the details of how the budgeting process works. Because if you understand that and if you have ever had to manage a bill on either the majority or the minority side of the aisle, you will understand this is not a workable process.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to identify myself with the comments that I have heard this morning from both sides of the aisle relative to this bill.

When we wrote this bill at the subcommittee, where I serve with the dis-

tinguished chairman and the ranking member and some very thoughtful Members, I spoke with great reservations about the allocations that we had with respect to this bill.

The balancing act that we have is that the American people expect us to do our job to the fullest extent. And without the resources of Congressional Research Service, without the Capitol Hill Police to adequately protect all of the grounds and the people and the millions of visitors that come through here every year, we cannot adequately do our job. And so, that is the balancing act. Yet, we must lead by example on tightening our belts as tight and as slim as we can without crossing the line of inefficiency.

Sometimes we cannot afford not to invest in these resources. And that is where we find ourselves. So this manager's amendment restores the necessary money for us to feel like we are doing our job effectively and efficiently, which is what the people demand.

□ 1130

I want to applaud our leadership for finding the extra money, working in a bipartisan way, staying cool, working together, because, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, at this point my reservations have diminished and we can support this bill collectively in a bipartisan manner knowing that we are doing what is right, because these are critical needs. Our Capitol Hill Police deserve our appreciation. They deserve to be called by their first name. They deserve to be recognized on a daily basis for laying their life down. They stand between any threat to not only us but all the people in this great place. It is important that we appreciate them. It is important that we fund them adequately.

The folks at the Library of Congress deserve our support. Encourage them to be more efficient but support these critical missions of the legislative branch through this bill. I hope in a bipartisan way the whole House will now come together and rally around this bill and support it enthusiastically because I think it strikes a careful balance between efficiency and funding the essential services that the American people expect to see and to benefit from through the United States Congress.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him on the job that he has done.

During committee markup of this bill, the subcommittee chairman urged the members to support it despite in my opinion, which the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) has also reflected, its substantial flaws, saying at

that point in time we were in the second round of a 10-round fight. In my opinion, the committee got knocked out in the third round. Having struggled to its feet, the committee now offers a somewhat better bill if the manager's amendment is adopted. But, in my opinion, this bill is still not a winner. We should knock it out again and demand even better for the people we serve.

As members recall, the committee bill was so underfunded that it drew widespread, justified criticism. It would have cut over 1,700 employees from an already pared down legislative branch. It would have denied COLAs to the employees who remained. It would have dramatically impaired our ability to function, and not because the legislative branch is overfunded. It is not overfunded. This subcommittee has in the past under Democrats and Republicans been quite frugal. The committee's report admits that the cuts were, and I quote, "not necessarily reductions the committee would have made if not constrained by the budget resolution." This is the immaculate-conception argument that has been used repeatedly with respect to our appropriation bills. Translation: these cuts were required to finance the GOP's election-year tax cuts.

The most egregious cut in the committee bill, of course, has been discussed. It would have cut 438 Capitol Police officers from the rolls, 338 by a reduction in force. Let me say something with respect to the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. YOUNG) observations. I do not have figures yet as to uniformed personnel, but our Committee on House Administration of which I have the privilege of being the ranking member, has authorized 1,511 personnel for the Capitol Police. Why? Because unlike the cities that the gentleman from Florida mentioned, we have millions, yes, millions of visitors to this Capitol complex every year, our constituents from all over the country.

The bill as it was originally presented by the committee would pare security back below where it was 23 months ago, before our review generated by the deaths of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson. The committee refused the Police Board's request for 100 new officers that the two postshooting reviews urged are needed to make the Capitol safe for visitors, staff and Members. Today's somewhat better bill, if the manager's amendment is adopted, funds 1,354 officers on the rolls, about 160 less than are authorized; it fills at least some of the 100 or more vacancies expected next year; and funds a class of recruits that just started training. But in my view, Mr. Chairman, it fails to provide adequate security for thousands who work in or visit the complex, including the police, themselves, on a daily basis.

Police funding is not the only problem with this bill. The committee bill

would have slashed spending for the General Accounting Office, which helps us find waste, fraud and abuse in Federal spending, so deeply as to cut 707 staff. The manager's amendment somewhat solves that problem, and I congratulate the ranking member and the chairman for supporting it. But the somewhat better bill still cuts GAO by \$8.7 million below this year and 230 FTEs. So it is not like we are making anybody whole here. In 1999, GAO recommendations yielded savings of \$57 for every \$1 we spent on the GAO. That is a good return, 57 to 1. I believe our taxpayers would think if we saved \$57 by spending \$1, we are ahead of the game.

The committee bill also took, in my opinion, a meat-axe to the Government Printing Office, lopping over 25 percent of its funding and 400 staff. The Senate bill increases GPO spending, only by four-tenths of a point, but increased it. The committee bill would have effectively ended the depository library program used by thousands and thousands of Americans weekly in most of our districts, eliminated entire classes of congressional printing and even printing for next January's inauguration which we know is coming.

The improved bill still cuts GPO by 7.4 percent and 176 FTEs, including RIFs for 13 people who compile the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Index. It restores most cuts to the depository program, I am referring to the manager's amendment, but still cuts printed publications, the kind most library customers actually want to read, going into libraries by 15,000. It restores the inaugural printing, but leaves Members without publications like "Our Flag." It may sound silly, but every school child in America loves that publication and learns more about the flag. It cuts "How Our Laws Are Made" and delays reprinting of the only official version of the U.S. Code.

The committee bill would have cut 156 staff from the Architect's office, many of them custodians and laborers who perform the basic maintenance of the Capitol. The somewhat better bill does fund the Architect staff but rejects his request for 13 FTEs to work on life safety matters, including fire safety which should be a priority for this institution.

Overall, the bill still cuts 368 FTEs legislative-branch wide, after we have under the leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina and his predecessors made substantial cuts every year over the last 5 years and indeed, as Mr. Lombard knows, even before that under Democratic control.

Mr. Chairman, I regrettably cannot support this bill even with the manager's amendment. It shortchanges Capitol security and life safety programs, depository-library patrons, oversight of Federal spending and other functions to pay for election-year

tax cuts. For most accounts, the Senate figures are where we should be after conference.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, if I read the lock box amendment right, I have a great concern about what they are trying to do. Much of the legislation we have passed initially is for negotiation purposes. We normally take projects out. We have taken as many as four destroyers out and over \$1 billion normally in the subcommittee. But there are times when amendments have been offered on the floor and we have lost as much as \$1 billion on the floor, but we go to the Senate and then we renegotiate the amount of money we have. As I understand the amendment, we would lose that money and we would lose the flexibility to negotiate with the Senate, or the other body; and they would have the same problem over there.

So this really, I think, could be detrimental to good government rather than help government. It certainly would not help us because in the end we would be determining on the floor, we would be reducing the amount of money when really all people want to reduce is one particular system which later on may want to be increased again. This really worries me.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I did not have the opportunity because of time constraints to mention this amendment, but I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, one of the senior members of the Committee on Appropriations, and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who have correctly pointed out the deficiencies of this lock-box amendment. I hope the chairman of our committee also believes that this would be harmful to our decision-making process and our flexibility, and would undermine our ability to make judgments on priorities as we proceed through the process, which is of course the point the gentleman from Pennsylvania made.

This amendment, of course, did not come out of the subcommittee, did not come out of the full committee, but was made in order by the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense, correctly observed the harmful effects that this would have on the entire House in a bipartisan way. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in urging our colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In response to the comments of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I would refer all of the Members of the House to the adverse report that the Committee on Appropriations did report on H.R. 853, which would have created this lock box. It is a very good description of why it is not workable.

Mr. MURTHA. I appreciate both gentlemen's comments. I would hope the House would be very careful in not adopting something that could be very detrimental to our flexibility in the long run, hurt our national security and I am sure have the same impact on any other bill that we take before the Congress.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in allowing me to speak this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I think the task that the subcommittee has labored over is often mischaracterized, it is misconstrued and it is thankless, I think, for the public and for oftentimes Members of this assembly. But it is key what they do to enable us to do our job as Members, to represent our constituents; and there are critical elements in this budget that enable us to protect and serve the public, their physical safety when they are here in Washington, D.C., and to provide information.

One particular item of focus for me deals with the adequate funding for the Congressional Research Service. I would like to thank the subcommittee for restoring the additional \$7.5 million. Before funding was increased, CRS was slated to have had to fire over 110 individuals, drastically reducing their ability to provide valuable research and assistance. And although I am pleased that the funding was increased, I am disappointed to see that the funding has not yet met the requested level and that without this additional money, it is going to be difficult or impossible for CRS to continue to provide for its carefully crafted multiyear CRS succession initiative.

I think it was very thoughtful on the part of the Congressional Research Service to try and deal with a potential catastrophe with 50 percent of their staff nearing eligibility for retirement or already eligible. The notion of being able to do some thoughtful overhire, bringing in some junior members to get the expertise, to be able to meet the needs of Congress in providing non-partisan, thoughtful, analytic benefit to help us do our job is smart.

I appreciate the fact that last year they were forced into sort of a Hobson's choice. There was a difficult addi-

tional cut that was laid upon them, and in their wisdom they elected to suspend this process. I do not think they should have been put in that box, I think that that was a false economy; but I think that that does not release us from the obligation as a Chamber to be able to provide those resources for them.

□ 1145

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to be able to continue to provide adequate research ability for the entire Congress to have this multidisciplinary expertise across all policy issues; that is an unusually broad range of expertise within this single institution, and it is given in a highly personal way. I think we have all been well served by the dedicated men and women who provide it.

I do hope that this budget continues to be a work in progress, and I hope that we will make progress in terms of adequately providing for this succession for CRS.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to support the manager's amendment, if that is adopted, and the Ryan amendment defeated, that we support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated before, we have nine steps in appropriating money, and three of them in the House, three in the Senate, then we go to conference, then we come back to the House and the Senate, and the President then signs the bill.

It is a long process, and we try to improve the legislation as we move along. We think that the manager's amendment will be positive in this area.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on the subject of funding for the Capitol Police.

This Congress should take every opportunity possible to salute the police officers of this nation, as I do for those who serve my Congressional District in Orange County.

Our nation loses an officer almost every other day; we've lost three Capitol officers in the line of duty. And that doesn't include the ones who may be assaulted or injured.

The calling to serve in law enforcement comes with bravery and sacrifice.

The thin blue line protecting our homes, our families, and our communities—and the foremost symbol of American freedom and democracy—pays a price, and so do the loved ones they leave behind when tragedy strikes.

They shouldn't have to do this dangerous job with inadequate resources.

We have a responsibility to see that law enforcement—particularly those who guard the Capitol—have the resources they need.

I want to recognize my colleagues for their support of necessary funding for the U.S. Capitol Police force.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, this bill's treatment of the Copyright Office is just another example of voodoo economics. Time and time again, the majority signals that it just does not care about the creative community. The majority continually tries to shut down the National Endowment for the Arts in its quest to eradicate free expression, and now this. The majority is taking five million dollars from the Copyright Office—and for no good reason other than perhaps to eliminate the copyright protection for that free expression.

In the Information Age, copyrights have become the most important protections that creators can have for their work. In fact, piracy on the Internet is the number one fear that artists have, and the Copyright Office is the best shield against those pirates.

Unfortunately, while recent congressional mandates—such as the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act—have imposed dramatic new responsibilities on the Copyright Office in the form of new studies and reports, the majority failed to provide additional funds so it could carry out those duties without somehow interfering with its responsibilities to copyright holders. Clearly, this is an impossible task for any agency. This bill just adds fuel to the fire.

By cutting its funding, the Majority expects the Copyright Office to make up the difference by keeping more of the royalties it collects. That's just passing the buck. Those royalties are for the people who create the music, movies, books, and art that drive our culture—not for government salaries. And this is in the midst of a \$200 billion budget surplus.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns about the serious, negative consequences that H.R. 4616 will have on the operations of the U.S. Copyright Office. While it appears we will not have the opportunity to resolve these concerns before the House votes on H.R. 4616, I ask the bill's sponsors to address these concerns during conference.

H.R. 4616 cuts the Copyright Office's total net appropriations by 38 percent, or over \$5 million. As I stated, the consequences of these budgetary cuts are serious: the Copyright Office may be forced to fire as many as 130 people, and certainly will not be able to perform a variety of critical functions.

Though not a high-profile agency, the Copyright Office provides a variety of very important, useful services to this Congress and the American people. The Copyright Office provides legal and policy advice to the Congress on copyright issues, advice on which the Congress relies on an almost daily basis. The Copyright Office advises foreign governments on the development of copyright laws, and plays an integral role in inter-agency deliberations over intellectual property trade matters. It undertakes studies and rule-makings at the direction of Congress, and is currently engaged in a variety of important studies mandated by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. In fiscal year 1999 alone, the Copyright Office registered over one-half million copyrighted works. It administers the collection and distribution of royalties under compulsory licenses, and in doing so processes filings from

tens of thousands of cable operators, satellite carriers, and equipment manufacturers. It conducts Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panels, or CARPs, to settle disputes over copyright royalties. Perhaps most importantly, the Copyright Office plays a key role in ensuring that our Library of Congress contains the most comprehensive collection of creative works in the world.

As I indicated, the \$5 million cut in its \$12 million net appropriation will cause a reduction in force of 130 Copyright Office employees. To put it another way, this reduction works out to cutting 27 percent of the entire Copyright Office staff. Such a drastic cut in personnel will render the Copyright Office unable to perform many of the critical functions I have discussed. I don't even know how they will begin to decide which congressional mandates to ignore, or whose requests for policy support it will not honor.

It seems to me "penny-wise but pound foolish" to save \$5 million by drastically reducing the services rendered by the Copyright Office. In fact, pound for pound, the Copyright Office is easily one of the most efficient and effective agencies in the entire federal government. Simply put, it does a terrific and important job with already limited resources, and there is not a pound of fat to cut.

I recognize that the intent of these cuts was not to gut the operations of the Copyright Office. In fact, H.R. 4616 attempts to enable the Copyright Office to cope with this serious budgetary shortfall in the out years by suggesting that it raise fees to cover the shortfall. Unfortunately, the Copyright Office cannot, either as a legal or practical matter, raise its fees to cover the shortfall.

Effective July 1, 1999, the Copyright Office implemented a 3-year schedule of fees that raised fees for a variety of services from 50 percent to 220 percent. As a practical matter, the Copyright Office cannot turn around and raise its fees yet again: a comprehensive economic analysis undertaken pursuant to the recent fee increases indicated that higher fee increases would not be paid by the public, and thus would result in a decrease in fee revenue. I must remind my colleagues that, due to treaty obligations, we have a voluntary system of registering and recording copyrights.

Thus, fees can only be increased so high before copyright holders simply stop registering and paying. The economic analysis undertaken by the Copyright Office indicates that the recently implemented fee increases reach that maximum level of acceptance.

As a legal matter, the Copyright Office cannot simply raise its fees yet again. The Copyright Act mandates a procedure that the Copyright Office must follow in setting new fees, and this process takes approximately two years to implement. Thus, while H.R. 4516 assumes that the Copyright Office will make up for a fiscal year 2001 budget shortfall by raising fees, the Copyright Office would not legally be able to raise fees until fiscal year 2002.

In closing, I urge that the \$5 million cut in the Copyright Office budget be restored, if not now then during conference consideration of H.R. 4516. It seems a small expense to provide such important services.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr.

TAYLOR, for his hard work in preparing this bill and bringing it to the floor today. I certainly appreciate all the effort that has gone into making this look easy.

I wanted to talk briefly about one very important element of this bill, and that is the power plant which makes the Capitol run, and which will ultimately power and cool our new visitors center. What is also of interest to me is the fact this is the last power plant in Washington, D.C. which is fueled partially by burning coal. There used to be others—the GSA had two coal-burning plants, and Pepco also used to burn coal to generate energy. As a result of a need to meet Clean Air requirements in the District (which is in non-attainment for ozone), particularly on emissions of NO_x, which is an ozone precursor, those plants now rely on natural gas or distillate oil to generate energy.

In addition to knocking down NO_x emissions, natural gas also has benefit of reducing emissions of sulfur dioxides and PM, both of which are generated from burning coal or fuel oil.

For these reasons, I was pleased to learn that of the seven boilers that fire the Capital plant, five of them have already been converted to run on natural gas and/or fuel oil. It is my understanding that this conversion has already resulted in greatly reduced emissions, to the benefit of all those who live and work in this area.

In addition to the obvious public health benefit, I think it is important that we here in Congress lead by example, as we have in the conversion of these boilers. As we debate proposals and pass laws which lead to stringent air quality controls on the private sector, it is critical that we demonstrate that we are serious about this, and are willing to take the same kind of steps here in our own backyard.

For these reasons, I was pleased to read in the Capitol Hill Master Plan that as part of the expansion of the West Refrigeration Plant, "the historical reduction in reliance on coal will be continued, resulting in the complete phase-out of use by the year 2003. The boiler system will be converted to run on natural gas and fuel oil."

This is a continuation of the positive steps which have been taken to both modernize our power facilities, and reduce harmful emissions in the process. Now, I am aware that there has been an interest expressed by several Members and Senators in retaining a coal element of this plant, and that various options which entail "cleaner-burning coal are now under evaluation. I would anticipate that once the review of these options are completed, the original phase-out proposal will be recognized as the most practical, both from cost and air quality standpoint.

I had originally considered offering an amendment to ensure that the phase out and conversion timetable over to the cleaner fuels remained on track. While I will not be doing so today, I will remain interested in monitoring the developments surrounding the expansion of the Capital plant, and the ongoing conversion to natural gas and cleaner fuels. We have an obligation to lead by example, on air quality as on so many other issues, and so I look forward to working with the Chairman and my colleagues in the future to see to it that this

comes to pass. I submit a copy of my amendment to be placed in the RECORD.

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . No funds appropriated in this Act may be used to develop or implement any plan for fuel use at the Capitol Plant other than the fuel use plan set forth in the Capitol Plant Master Plan prepared by the Architect of the Capitol, dated May 11, 2000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 4516 is as follows:

H.R. 4516

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives, \$749,210,000, as follows:

HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$13,998,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$1,711,000, including \$25,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$1,677,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$2,039,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Majority Whip, \$1,427,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, including the Chief Deputy Minority Whip, \$1,065,000, including \$5,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip; Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities, \$399,000; Republican Steering Committee, \$744,000; Republican Conference, \$1,220,000; Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, \$1,315,000; Democratic Caucus, \$649,000; nine minority employees, \$1,196,000; training and program development—majority \$278,000; and training and program development—minority, \$278,000.

MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

INCLUDING MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE, OFFICIAL EXPENSES OF MEMBERS, AND OFFICIAL MAIL

For Members' representational allowances, including Members' clerk hire, official expenses, and official mail, \$400,527,000.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by House resolutions, \$89,896,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries and expenses of the Committee on Appropriations, \$20,231,000, including studies and examinations of executive agencies and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative

Reorganization Act of 1946 and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed: *Provided*, That such amount shall remain available for such salaries and expenses until December 31, 2002.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$86,369,000, including: for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Clerk, including not more than \$3,500, of which not more than \$2,500 is for the Family Room, for official representation and reception expenses, \$14,286,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including the position of Superintendent of Garages, and including not more than \$750 for official representation and reception expenses, \$3,596,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, \$54,997,000, of which \$1,054,000 shall remain available until expended, including \$24,912,000 for salaries, expenses and temporary personal services of House Information Resources, of which \$24,327,000 is provided herein: *Provided*, That of the amount provided for House Information Resources, \$5,760,000 shall be for net expenses of telecommunications: *Provided further*, That House Information Resources is authorized to receive reimbursement from Members of the House of Representatives and other governmental entities for services provided and such reimbursement shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to this account; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, \$3,197,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of General Counsel, \$806,000; for the Office of the Chaplain, \$140,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$1,172,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$2,045,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$5,085,000; for salaries and expenses of the Corrections Calendar Office, \$832,000; and for other authorized employees, \$213,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$138,189,000, including: supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$1,960,000; official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House, \$410,000; Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$135,426,000; and miscellaneous items including purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, inter-parliamentary receptions, and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$393,000.

CHILD CARE CENTER

For salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives Child Care Center, such amounts as are deposited in the account established by section 312(d)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1992 (40 U.S.C. 184g(d)(1)), subject to the level specified in the budget of the Center, as submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. During fiscal year 2001 and any succeeding fiscal year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives may—

(1) enter into contracts for the acquisition of severable services for a period that begins

in one fiscal year and ends in the next fiscal year to the same extent as the head of an executive agency under the authority of section 303L of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253l); and

(2) enter into multi-year contracts for the acquisitions of property and nonaudit-related services to the same extent as executive agencies under the authority of section 304B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254c).

SEC. 102. (a) PERMITTING NEW HOUSE EMPLOYEES TO BE PLACED ABOVE MINIMUM STEP OF COMPENSATION LEVEL.—The House Employees Position Classification Act (2 U.S.C. 291 et seq.) is amended by striking section 10 (2 U.S.C. 299).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to employees appointed on or after October 1, 2000.

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$3,072,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$6,174,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including: (1) an allowance of \$1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$500 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (3) an allowance of \$500 per month to one assistant and \$400 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (4) \$1,159,904 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,835,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than \$600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, \$70,120,000, of which \$33,586,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, and \$36,534,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon

approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, not more than \$2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and \$85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$6,549,000, to be disbursed by the Capitol Police Board or their delegate: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2001 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 103. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2001 for the Capitol Police Board for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings "SALARIES" and "GENERAL EXPENSES" upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives under the heading "SALARIES";

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate under the heading "SALARIES"; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of other transfers.

SEC. 104. (a) APPOINTMENT OF CERTIFYING OFFICERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE.—The Chief Administrative Officer of the U.S. Capitol Police, or when there is not a Chief Administrative Officer the Capitol Police Board, shall appoint certifying officers to certify all vouchers for payment from funds made available to the United States Capitol Police.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF CERTIFYING OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each officer or employee of the Capitol Police who has been duly authorized in writing by the Chief Administrative Officer, or the Capitol Police Board if there is not a Chief Administrative Officer, to certify vouchers pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

(A) be held responsible for the existence and correctness of the facts recited in the certificate or otherwise stated on the voucher or its supporting papers and for the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved;

(B) be held responsible and accountable for the correctness of the computations of certified vouchers; and

(C) be held accountable for and required to make good to the United States the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate made by such officer or employee, as well as for any payment prohibited by law or which did not represent a

legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved.

(2) **RELIEF BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General may, at the Comptroller General's discretion, relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for any payment otherwise proper if the Comptroller General finds—

(A) that the certification was based on official records and that the certifying officer or employee did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained, the actual facts; or

(B) that the obligation was incurred in good faith, that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved, and the United States has received value for such payment.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT OF LIABILITY.**—The liability of the certifying officers of the United States Capitol Police shall be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as currently provided with respect to the enforcement of the liability of disbursing and other accountable officers, and such officers shall have the right to apply for and obtain a decision by the Comptroller General on any question of law involved in a payment on any vouchers presented to them for certification.

SEC. 105. CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.—(a) There shall be within the Capitol Police an Office of Administration to be headed by a Chief Administrative Officer:

(1) The Chief Administrative Officer shall be appointed by the Comptroller General after consultation with the Capitol Police Board, and shall report to and serve at the pleasure of the Comptroller General.

(2) The Comptroller General shall appoint as Chief Administrative Officer an individual with the knowledge and skills necessary to carry out the responsibilities for budgeting, financial management, information technology, and human resource management described in this section.

(3) The Chief Administrative Officer shall receive basic pay at a rate determined by the Comptroller General, but not to exceed the annual rate of basic pay payable for ES-2 of the Senior Executive Service Basic Rates Schedule established for members of the Senior Executive Service of the General Accounting Office under section 733 of title 31.

(4) The Capitol Police shall reimburse from available appropriations any costs incurred by the General Accounting Office under this section.

(b) The Chief Administrative Officer shall have the following areas of responsibility:

(1) **BUDGETING.**—The Chief Administrative Officer shall—

(A) after consulting with the Chief of Police on the portion of the budget covering uniformed police force personnel, prepare and submit to the Capitol Police Board an annual budget for the Capitol Police;

(B) execute the budget and monitor through periodic examinations the execution of the Capitol Police budget in relation to actual obligations and expenditures.

(2) **FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.**—The Chief Administrative Officer shall—

(A) oversee all financial management activities relating to the programs and operations of the Capitol Police;

(B) develop and maintain an integrated accounting and financial system for the Capitol Police, including financial reporting and internal controls, which—

(i) complies with applicable accounting principles, standards, and requirements, and internal control standards;

(ii) complies with any other requirements applicable to such systems;

(iii) provides for—

(I) complete, reliable, consistent, and timely information which is prepared on a uniform basis and which is responsive to financial information needs of the Capitol Police;

(II) the development and reporting of cost information;

(III) the integration of accounting and budgeting information; and

(IV) the systematic measurement of performance;

(C) direct, manage, and provide policy guidance and oversight of Capitol Police financial management personnel, activities, and operations, including—

(i) the recruitment, selection, and training of personnel to carry out Capitol Police financial management functions; and

(ii) the implementation of Capitol Police asset management systems, including systems for cash management, debt collection, and property and inventory management and control; and

(D) the Chief Administrative Officer shall prepare annual financial statements for the Capitol Police and provide for an annual audit of the financial statements by an independent public accountant in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

(3) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**—The Chief Administrative Officer shall—

(A) direct, coordinate, and oversee the acquisition, use, and management of information technology by the Capitol Police;

(B) promote and oversee the use of information technology to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of programs of the Capitol Police; and

(C) establish and enforce information technology principles, guidelines, and objectives, including developing and maintaining an information technology architecture for the Capitol Police.

(4) **HUMAN RESOURCES.**—The Chief Administrative Officer shall—

(A) direct, coordinate, and oversee human resource management activities of the Capitol Police, except that with respect to uniformed police force personnel, the Chief Administrative Officer shall perform these activities in cooperation with the Chief of the Capitol Police;

(B) develop and monitor payroll and time and attendance systems and employee services; and

(C) develop and monitor processes for recruiting, selecting, appraising, and promoting employees.

(c) Administrative provisions with respect to the Office of Administration:

(1) The Chief Administrative Officer is authorized to select, appoint, employ, and discharge such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Office of Administration but he shall not have the authority to hire or discharge uniformed police force personnel.

(2) The Chief Administrative Officer may utilize resources of another agency on a reimbursable basis to be paid from available appropriations of the Capitol Police.

(d) No later than 180 days after appointment, the Chief Administrative Officer shall prepare, after consultation with the Capitol Police Board and the Chief of the Capitol Police, a plan—

(1) describing the policies, procedures, and actions the Chief Administrative Officer will take in carrying out the responsibilities assigned under this section;

(2) identifying and defining responsibilities and roles of all offices, bureaus, and divisions of the Capitol Police for budgeting, financial management, information technology, and human resources management; and

(3) detailing mechanisms for ensuring that the offices, bureaus, and divisions perform their responsibilities and roles in a coordinated and integrated manner.

(e) No later than September 30, 2001, the Chief Administrative Officer shall prepare, after consultation with the Capitol Police Board and the Chief of the Capitol Police, a report on the Chief Administrative Officer's progress in implementing the plan described in subsection (d) and recommendations to improve the budgeting, financial, information technology, and human resources management of the Capitol Police, including organizational, accounting and administrative control, and personnel changes.

(f) The Chief Administrative Officer shall submit the plan required in subsection (d) and the report required in subsection (e) to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(g) As of October 1, 2002, unless otherwise determined by the Comptroller General, the Chief Administrative Officer established by section (a) will cease to be an employee of the General Accounting Office and will become an employee of the Capitol Police, and the Capitol Police Board shall assume all responsibilities of the Comptroller General under this section.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, \$2,201,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to employ more than 43 individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than 120 days each, and not more than 10 additional individuals for not more than 6 months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations Acts as required by law, \$29,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), \$1,816,000.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), including not more than \$3,000 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, \$25,100,000: *Provided*, That no part

of such amount may be used for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS
CAPITOL BUILDINGS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment, including not more than \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and not to exceed \$20,000 for attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$41,953,000, of which \$4,280,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$4,557,000, of which \$25,000 shall remain available until expended.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House office buildings, \$29,685,000, of which \$123,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, \$38,555,000, of which \$200,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$4,400,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2001.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$66,200,000: *Provided*, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the

Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress, \$65,457,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Senators, Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 106. (a) CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING THROUGH CLERK OF HOUSE AND SECRETARY OF SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of title 44, United States Code, or any other law, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate such sums as may be necessary for congressional printing and binding services.

(2) PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES.—Estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for congressional printing and binding services shall be prepared and submitted by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate in accordance with title 31, United States Code, in the same manner as estimates and requests are prepared for other legislative branch services under such title, except that such requests shall be based upon the results of the study conducted under subsection (b) (with respect to any fiscal year covered by such study).

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2003 and each succeeding fiscal year.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During fiscal year 2001, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall conduct a comprehensive study of the needs of the House and Senate for congressional printing and binding services during fiscal year 2003 and succeeding fiscal years (includ-

ing transitional issues during fiscal year 2002), and shall include in the study an analysis of the most cost-effective program or programs for providing printed or other media-based publications for House and Senate uses.

(2) SUBMISSION TO COMMITTEES.—The Clerk and the Secretary shall submit the study conducted under paragraph (1) to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who shall review the study and prepare such regulations or other materials (including proposals for legislation) as each considers appropriate to enable the Clerk and the Secretary to carry out congressional printing and binding services in accordance with this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “congressional printing and binding services” means the following services:

(1) Authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of congressional information in any format.

(2) Printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol.

(3) Preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record.

(4) Printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress.

(5) Printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient.

This title may be cited as the “Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 2001”.

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$3,216,000.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$269,864,000, of which not more than \$6,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2001, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than \$350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2001 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: *Provided*, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation

or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$6,850,000: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$10,459,575 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$2,506,000 is to remain available until expended for the acquisition and partial support for implementation of an Integrated Library System (ILS): *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$5,957,800 is to remain available until expended for the purpose of teaching educators how to incorporate the Library's digital collections into school curricula, which amount shall be transferred to the educational consortium formed to conduct the "Joining Hands Across America: Local Community Initiative" project as approved by the Library: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, \$404,000 is to remain available until expended for a collaborative digitization and telecommunications project with the United States Military Academy and any remaining balance is available for other Library purposes.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, \$38,771,000, of which not more than \$26,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2001 under 17 U.S.C. 708(d): *Provided*, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under 17 U.S.C. 708(d), in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,783,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2001 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than \$31,783,000: *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an "International Copyright Institute" in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: *Provided further*, That not more than \$4,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), \$48,507,000, of which \$14,135,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$5,394,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be

available, in an amount of not more than \$199,630, of which \$59,300 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian of Congress, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants such manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a)(10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 204. Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than \$5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 205. Of the amount appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than \$12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 206. (a) For fiscal year 2001, the obligatory authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed \$92,845,000.

(b) The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

SEC. 207. Section 1 of an Act to authorize acquisition of certain real property for the Library of Congress, and for other purposes, approved December 15, 1997 (2 U.S.C. 141 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) TRANSFER PAYMENT BY ARCHITECT.—Notwithstanding the limitation on reimbursement or transfer of funds under subsection (a) of this section, the Architect of the Capitol may, not later than 90 days after acquisition of the property under this section, transfer funds to the entity from which the property was acquired by the Architect of the Capitol. Such transfers may not exceed a total of \$16,500,000."

SEC. 208. The Librarian of Congress may convert to permanent positions 84 indefinite,

time-limited positions in the National Digital Library Program authorized in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996 for the Library of Congress under the heading, "Salaries and Expenses" (Public Law 104-53). Notwithstanding any other provision of law regarding qualifications and methods of appointment of employees of the Library of Congress, the Librarian may fill these permanent positions through the non-competitive conversion of the incumbents in the "indefinite-not-to-exceed" positions to "permanent" positions.

SEC. 209. During fiscal year 2001 and fiscal years thereafter, the Librarian of Congress may transfer among available accounts amounts appropriated to the Library and amounts appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of Library buildings and grounds, with the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Amounts so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purpose for the same period as the appropriation or account to which transferred. This transfer authority is in addition to any other transfer authority provided by law. The Librarian shall consult with the Architect of the Capitol before proposing transfers involving amounts appropriated to the Architect.

SEC. 210. The Library of Congress may for such employees as it deems appropriate authorize a payment to employees who voluntarily separate before January 1, 2001, whether by retirement or resignation, which payment shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5597(d) of title 5, United States Code.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$15,133,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their on-line access to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, \$11,606,000: *Provided*, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed \$175,000: *Provided further*, That amounts of not more than \$2,000,000 from current year appropriations are available for the cost of publications distributed in prior years: *Provided further*, That any unobligated or unexpended balances in this account or accounts for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years may be transferred to the Government Printing Office revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of this heading, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal

year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That not more than \$2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings "OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS" and "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,285 workyears (or such other number of workyears as the Public Printer may request, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives): *Provided further*, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15: *Provided further*, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed \$75,000.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not more than \$10,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6), and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6), and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, \$351,529,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$1,900,000 of payments received under 31 U.S.C. 782 shall be available for use in fiscal year 2001: *Provided further*, That not more than \$1,100,000 of reimbursements received under 31 U.S.C. 9105 shall be available for use in fiscal year 2001: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to the

Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2001 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 303. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 306. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104-1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 307. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed \$252,000.

SEC. 308. (a) REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED POSITIONS FOR CAPITOL POLICE AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS POLICE.—The number of full-time equivalent officers and members of the United States Capitol Police and the number of full-time equivalent officers and members of the Library of Congress Police authorized for fiscal year 2001 shall be reduced by the number of officers and members who retire, resign, or are otherwise separated from employment with the United States Capitol Police or the Library of Congress Police (as the case may be) during the fiscal year.

(b) WAIVER.—The Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate may waive or modify the application of subsection (a).

SEC. 309. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act under the heading "Architect of the Capitol" or "Botanic Garden" shall be obligated or expended for a construction contract in excess of \$100,000, unless such contract includes a provision that requires liquidated damages for contractor caused delay in an amount commensurate with the daily net usable square foot cost of leasing similar space in a first class office building within two miles of the United States Capitol multiplied by the square footage to be constructed under the contract.

SEC. 310. Upon request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, during fiscal year 2001 the Secretary of Defense shall provide protective services on a non-reimbursable basis to the United States Capitol Police with respect to—

(1) the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States; and

(2) the joint session of Congress held to receive a message from the President of the United States on the State of the Union.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is in order except those printed in House report 106-685. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed, may be offered only by a Member designated by the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 1 printed in the House report 106-685.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

Page 2, line 5, strike "\$749,210,000" and insert "\$769,551,000".

Page 2, line 8, strike "\$13,998,000" and insert "\$14,378,000".

Page 2, line 9, strike "\$1,711,000" and insert "\$1,759,000".

Page 2, line 10, strike "\$1,677,000" and insert "\$1,726,000".

Page 2, line 12, strike "\$2,039,000" and insert "\$2,096,000".

Page 2, line 15, strike "\$1,427,000" and insert "\$1,466,000".

Page 2, line 18, strike "\$1,065,000" and insert "\$1,096,000".

Page 2, line 20, strike "\$399,000" and insert "\$410,000".

Page 2, line 21, strike "\$744,000" and insert "\$765,000".

Page 2, line 21, strike "\$1,220,000" and insert "\$1,255,000".

Page 2, line 22, strike "\$1,315,000" and insert "\$1,352,000".

Page 2, line 23, strike "\$649,000" and insert "\$668,000".

Page 2, line 24, strike "\$1,196,000" and insert "\$1,229,000".

Page 3, line 8, strike "\$400,527,000" and insert "\$410,182,000".

Page 3, line 13, strike "\$89,896,000" and insert "\$92,196,000".

Page 3, line 18, strike "\$20,231,000" and insert "\$20,628,000".

Page 4, line 3, strike "\$86,369,000" and insert "\$90,403,000".

Page 4, line 7, strike "\$14,286,000" and insert "\$14,590,000".

Page 4, line 11, strike "\$3,596,000" and insert "\$3,692,000".

Page 4, line 12, strike "\$54,997,000" and insert "\$58,550,000".

Page 4, line 14, strike "\$24,912,000" and insert "\$26,605,000".

Page 4, line 16, strike "\$24,327,000" and insert "\$26,020,000".

Page 4, line 18, strike "\$5,760,000" and insert "\$6,497,000".

Page 4, line 25, strike "\$3,197,000" and insert "\$3,249,000".

Page 5, line 5, strike "\$1,172,000" and insert "\$1,201,000".

Page 5, line 13, strike "\$138,189,000" and insert "\$141,764,000".

Page 5, line 15, strike "\$1,960,000" and insert "\$2,235,000".

Page 5, line 19, strike "\$135,426,000" and insert "\$138,726,000".

Page 8, line 22, strike "\$70,120,000" and insert "\$92,769,000".

Page 8, line 22, strike "\$33,586,000" and insert "\$45,683,000".

Page 8, line 25, strike "\$36,534,000" and insert "\$47,086,000".

Page 21, line 8, strike "\$25,100,000" and insert "\$27,403,000".

Page 22, line 6, strike "\$41,953,000" and insert "\$44,234,000".

Page 22, line 11, strike "\$4,557,000" and insert "\$5,217,000".

Page 22, line 15, strike "\$29,685,000" and insert "\$32,750,000".

Page 23, line 9, strike "\$38,555,000" and insert "\$39,151,000".

Page 23, line 21, strike "\$66,200,000" and insert "\$73,810,000".

Page 24, line 11, strike "\$65,457,000" and insert "\$69,626,000".

Page 36, line 14, strike "\$15,133,000" and insert "\$15,837,000".

Page 36, line 25, strike "\$11,606,000" and insert "\$25,652,000".

Page 39, line 21, strike "\$351,529,000" and insert "\$368,896,000".

Strike section 308 (and redesignate the succeeding provisions accordingly).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$95.8 million to the bill. It is a bipartisan amendment, and is offered on behalf of myself and the ranking minority Member of the Subcommittee on Legislative, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

It will provide sufficient funds for all staff COLAs and merit increases throughout the legislative branch. That includes Member office staff, committee and our administrative staff, and our support agencies like CRS, GAO, the Architect's work force and others.

It will add \$20.3 million for the operations of the House, including an amount sufficient for Members' representational allowances. The amendment adds \$22.6 million above the reported bill for police salaries. This will fund an additional 48 policemen to the number currently on board.

There are also 93 officers in training that will soon be deployed. This means we will end up with around 1,241 sworn officers, that is almost 200 above the number we had on the tragic day in 1998 when the shootings took place.

We want to monitor the number of police personnel closely. They do an outstanding job, but we also want to see improvements in technology and technical security measures. They have been funded, and there needs to be an interest to put these items in place, and we urge that to take place.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) and I have asked the police board to substitute more modern technology for our security operations. We would like to see a review of the weekend and late-at-night open building policies that requires all of the posts to be staffed regardless of need or traffic.

We do have several million visitors here, but unlike cities that have populations in the millions, those visitors are not here at night. They are not here on all the weekends and certainly on holidays.

Since we believe these advances will reduce the manpower needs, the committee agreement has fenced some \$2.5 million of the salary appropriations. These are the projected costs of filling

vacancies that occur next year. These funds can only be spent with the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a few brief remarks about the balance of the amendment. We have added \$7.3 million to the Architect of the Capitol so that there will be no need for any layoffs. Building cleanliness and maintenance will be maintained and extra daytime cleaning of all our restrooms has been funded.

We have added sufficient funds, \$7.6 million, that CRS will maintain their current work force. If there is a need for more funds by CRS or the Copyright Office to avoid staff attrition losses, we will direct the Library of Congress to use the transfer authority provided in the bill to help CRS or copyright. We have added \$18.2 million back to the Government Printing Office. All COLAs are funded.

Also, the amendment restores all funding for the depository libraries to receive the 25,000 Federal publications that are only available in paper and other tangible formats.

Finally, we have added \$17.4 million to the General Accounting Office. No reductions in force will be necessary at GAO. Mr. Chairman, that is the substance of the manager's amendment; all \$95.8 million of it.

The bill will still be \$9.8 million below the fiscal year 2000 level, including pending supplementals. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

I have a more detailed statement on this matter that I will place in the RECORD.

MANAGER'S AMENDMENT

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$95.8 million to the bill.

It is a bipartisan amendment and is offered on behalf of myself and the ranking minority member of the legislative subcommittee, Ed PASTOR.

During general debate, I stated several reasons for offering the amendment.

If the amendment is adopted, the bill will not require any reductions-in-force in any legislative agency.

It will provide sufficient funds for all staff COLA's and merit increases throughout the legislative branch. That includes Member office staff, committee and our administrative staff, and our support agencies like CRS, GAO, the Architect's workforce, and the others.

It will add \$20.3 million for the operations of the House, including an amount sufficient for Members' representational allowances. It will fund new Members' orientation costs, all transition costs to the 107th Congress and a small, but sufficient amount of funds to deal with the recent threats posed by Internet viruses.

The amendment adds \$22.6 million above the reported bill for police salaries. That's an increase of \$14.4 million (18%) above the FY2000 appropriation. This will fund an additional 48 policemen to the number currently on board.

In addition to these 48 police officers we are funding with this amendment, there are 93 officers in training that will soon be deployed. So there will be 141 additional security personnel shortly. That means we will end up with about 1,241 sworn officers. That's 189 above the number we had on that tragic day in 1998 when the shootings took place.

We want to monitor the number of police personnel closely. We also want to see improvements in technical security measures. They have been funded and there needs to be an impetus to get these items installed. Mr. Pastor and I have asked the police board to substitute more modern technology to our security operations. The technology has been funded and should reduce our reliance on additional police personnel. As this technology gets installed (cameras, detection devices, etc.), we will look at the size of the force to see if reductions can be made.

We would like to see a review of the weekend and late-at-night open building policies that require all of our posts to be staffed regardless of need or the traffic.

We have been working with the chief and others to reassess the post assignment strategy they use. We will make sure there are a sufficient number of officers at each door. But we do not want so many that they become distracted.

Since we believe these advances will reduce manpower needs, the committee agreement has fenced \$2.446 million of the salary

appropriation. These are the projected costs of filling vacancies that occur next year. Those funds can only be spent with the approval of the appropriations committees.

In addition, the new chief, Jim Varey, and I have agreed that we want the force to be well trained. We will work with them to make improvements in that area.

We want our officers to be well paid so that they are not going to be trained and then recruited away by the Metropolitan Police Force or other law enforcement agencies.

So we will be working closely with police management to make sure they have the resources they need, the respect they deserve, and the recognition that they cannot be expected to do the impossible.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a few brief remarks about the balance of the amendment.

We have added \$7.3 million to the Architect of the Capitol so that there will be no need for any layoffs. Building cleanliness and maintenance will be maintained and extra daytime cleaning of all our restrooms has been funded.

We have added sufficient funds (\$7.6 million) so that CRS will maintain their current workforce. There will be no diminution of their services to the Members.

If there is a need for more funds by CRS or the Copyright Office to avoid staff attrition losses, we will direct the Library of Congress to use the transfer authority provided in the bill to help CRS or copyright. That is the virtue of having some flexibility in the appropriation available to our agencies.

We have added \$18.2 million back to the Government Printing Office. All COLA's are funded. Some of those funds will restore several documents to the printing appropriation such as the Congressional Directory, printing for the 2001 inauguration, and several other documents.

Also, the amendment restores all funding for the Depository Libraries to receive the 25,000 Federal publications that are only available in paper and other tangible formats. None of the highly skilled document specialists will lose their jobs.

Finally, we have added \$17.4 million to the General Accounting Office. No reductions in force will be necessary at GAO. We all value and respect the job that great agency does. It was never our intent to damage GAO capabilities, and I said so on several occasions. But our earlier allocation gave us no choice.

Mr. Chairman, that is the substance of the managers' amendment—all \$95.8 million of it.

The bill will still be \$9.8 million below the FY2000 level, including pending supplementals.

For those who do not believe supplementals should be counted, the bill is only above this year's level—by \$2.8 million.

I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

I will insert a table which reflects the amounts in the bill included in the managers' amendment.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4516)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Salaries and Expenses					
House Leadership Offices					
Office of the Speaker.....	1,723	1,798	1,759	+36	-39
Office of the Majority Floor Leader.....	1,888	1,781	1,726	+38	-35
Office of the Minority Floor Leader.....	2,050	2,140	2,066	+46	-44
Office of the Majority Whip.....	1,404	1,500	1,466	+62	-34
Office of the Minority Whip.....	1,042	1,121	1,086	+54	-25
Speaker's Office for Legislative Floor Activities.....	408	417	410	+4	-7
Republican Steering Committee.....	755	779	765	+10	-14
Democratic Steering and Policy Committee.....	1,225	1,289	1,255	+30	-34
Democratic Caucus.....	1,324	1,381	1,352	+28	-29
Nine minority employees.....	657	667	668	+11	-19
Training and Development Program.....	1,218	1,281	1,229	+11	-22
Majority.....	284	290	278	-6	-12
Minority.....	284	290	278	-6	-12
Subtotal, House Leadership Offices.....	14,060	14,704	14,378	+318	-326
Members' Representational Allowances					
Including Members' Clerk Hire, Official					
Expenses of Members, and Official Mail					
Expenses.....	406,279	422,664	410,182	+3,903	-12,712
Committee Employees					
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations).....	93,878	99,242	92,198	-1,682	-7,048
Committee on Appropriations (including studies and investigations).....	21,065	22,530	20,628	-467	-1,902
Subtotal, Committee employees.....	114,973	121,772	112,824	-2,149	-8,948
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Clerk.....	14,881	15,882	14,590	-291	-1,272
Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	3,746	3,856	3,662	-54	-166
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	57,289	64,180	58,550	+1,261	-5,830
Office of Inspector General.....	3,926	4,040	3,249	-677	-791
Office of General Counsel.....	840	877	808	-34	-71
Office of the Chaplain.....	136	139	140	+4	+1
Office of the Parliamentarian.....	1,172	1,256	1,201	+26	-55
Office of the Parliamentarian.....	(1,011)	(1,066)	(1,035)	(+24)	(-51)
Compilation of precedents of the House of Representatives.....	(181)	(170)	(166)	(+5)	(-4)
Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House.....	2,045	2,130	2,045		-55
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House.....	5,065	5,140	5,065		-55
Legislative Calendar Office.....	825	851	832	+7	-19
Parliamentary authorized employees.....	206	213	213	+8	
Technical Assistants, Office of the Attending Physician.....	(206)	(213)	(213)	(+8)	
Subtotal, Salaries, Officers and Employees.....	90,150	98,546	90,403	+253	-8,143
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims.....	2,741	3,381	2,235	-506	-1,146
Official mail for committees, leadership offices, and administrative offices of the House.....	410	410	410		
Government contributions.....	128,704	138,365	138,726	+10,022	+371
Miscellaneous items.....	676	676	363	-283	-283
Subtotal, Allowances and expenses.....	132,531	142,822	141,764	+9,233	-1,058
Total, salaries and expenses.....	757,993	800,738	789,551	+11,558	-31,187
Total, House of Representatives.....	757,993	800,738	789,551	+11,558	-31,187
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Economic Committee.....	3,200	3,315	3,072	-126	-243
Joint Committee on Taxation.....	6,431	6,747	6,174	-257	-573
Office of the Attending Physician					
Medical supplies, equipment, expenses, and allowances.....	1,991	1,835	1,835	-56	
Capitol Police Board					
Capitol Police					
Salaries:					
Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.....	37,582	49,396	45,683	+8,101	-3,883
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.....	40,776	51,532	47,086	+6,310	-4,446
Pending amended request, overtime expenses.....		7,922			-7,922
Subtotal, salaries.....	78,358	108,820	92,769	+14,411	-16,051
General expenses.....	6,549	9,960	6,549		-3,411
Subtotal, Capitol Police.....	84,907	118,780	99,318	+14,411	-19,462
Pending supplemental, Security enhancement fund for Library security.....	1,874			-1,874	

NOTE: FY 2000 enacted includes 0.38% rescissions and amounts pending in H.R. 3906 supplemental.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4516)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
to Guide Service and Special Services Office.....	2,293	2,371	2,201	-92	-170
ments of Appropriations.....	30	30	29	-1	-1
Total, Joint Items	100,826	133,078	112,829	+ 12,003	-20,449
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE					
Salaries and expenses	1,992	2,095	1,816	-178	-279
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	26,121	28,493	27,403	+ 1,282	-1,090
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Capitol Buildings and Grounds					
Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses	53,697	60,038	44,234	-9,463	-15,804
Capitol grounds.....	5,408	6,120	5,217	-189	-903
House office buildings.....	41,360	53,269	32,750	-8,600	-20,519
Capitol Power Plant.....	41,897	45,272	43,561	+ 1,854	-1,721
Offsetting collections.....	-3,965	-4,400	-4,400	-415	
Net subtotal, Capitol Power Plant.....	37,912	40,872	39,151	+ 1,239	-1,721
Total, Architect of the Capitol	138,365	160,299	121,352	-17,013	-38,947
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Congressional Research Service					
Salaries and expenses	70,973	75,640	73,810	+ 2,837	-1,830
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Congressional printing and binding	73,297	80,800	69,626	-3,671	-11,174
Total, title I, Congressional Operations.....	1,199,367	1,281,143	1,176,187	+ 6,820	-104,956
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES					
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses	3,436	4,916	3,216	-222	-1,700
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
ries and expenses	265,803	292,174	269,864	+ 4,061	-22,310
uthority to spend receipts	-6,850	-6,850	-6,850		
Net subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	258,953	285,324	263,014	+ 4,061	-22,310
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses	37,485	38,908	38,771	+ 1,286	-132
Authority to spend receipts	-26,254	-26,783	-31,783	-5,529	-5,000
Net subtotal, Copyright Office.....	11,231	12,120	6,988	-4,243	-5,132
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses	47,802	48,963	48,507	+ 705	-478
Furniture and furnishings.....	5,394	6,020	5,394		-626
Total, Library of Congress (except CRS).....	323,390	352,447	323,903	+ 523	-28,544
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Library Buildings and Grounds					
Structural and mechanical care	19,857	20,278	15,837	-4,020	-4,441
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Office of Superintendent of Documents					
Salaries and expenses	29,872	34,451	25,652	-4,220	-8,799
Government Printing Office Revolving Fund					
GPO revolving fund		6,000			-6,000
Total, Government Printing Office.....	29,872	40,451	25,652	-4,220	-14,799
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	378,961	402,918	371,898	-7,065	-31,022
Offsetting collections.....	-1,400	-3,000	-3,000	-1,600	
Total, General Accounting Office.....	377,561	399,918	368,898	-8,665	-31,022
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	754,106	818,010	737,504	-16,604	-80,506
Grand total.....	1,923,475	2,099,153	1,913,691	-9,784	-185,462

NOTE: FY 2000 enacted includes 0.38% rescissions and amounts pending in H.R. 3906 supplemental.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4516—Continued)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS					
House of Representatives.....	757,993	800,738	769,551	+11,558	-31,187
Joint Items	100,626	133,078	112,629	+12,003	-20,449
Office of Compliance.....	1,992	2,095	1,816	-178	-279
Congressional Budget Office	26,121	28,483	27,403	+1,282	-1,080
Architect of the Capitol.....	138,366	160,299	121,352	-17,013	-38,947
Library of Congress: Congressional Research Service.....	70,973	75,640	73,810	+2,837	-1,830
Congressional printing and binding, Government Printing Office	73,297	80,800	69,626	-3,671	-11,174
Total, title I, Congressional operations.....	1,199,397	1,281,143	1,176,167	+8,820	-104,956
TITLE II - OTHER AGENCIES					
Botanic Garden	3,438	4,916	3,216	-222	-1,700
Library of Congress (except CRS).....	323,380	352,447	323,903	+523	-28,544
Architect of the Capitol (Library buildings & grounds).....	19,857	20,278	15,637	-4,020	-4,441
Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding).....	29,872	40,451	25,652	-4,220	-14,799
General Accounting Office	377,561	399,918	368,896	-8,665	-31,022
Total, title II, Other agencies.....	754,106	818,010	737,504	-16,604	-80,506
Grand total.....	1,923,475	2,099,153	1,913,691	-9,784	-185,462

NOTE: FY 2000 enacted includes 0.36% rescissions and amounts pending in H.R. 3908 supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) rise to claim the time in opposition?

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed, but I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a minute to ask my colleagues to support this manager's amendment. The chairman and I have worked to make this bill a better bill, tried to fund the security needs, the needs that we have in order to maintain the House and the Capitol and reduce the pain. I would ask my colleagues to support the manager's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 106-685.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CAMP:

Page 7, insert after line 8 the following (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 103. (a) REQUIRING AMOUNTS REMAINING IN MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES TO BE USED FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION OR TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEBT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES—MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES" shall be available only for fiscal year 2001. Any amount remaining after all payments are made under such allowances for fiscal year 2001 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives shall have authority to prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "Member of the House of Representatives" means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I first want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman of the subcommittee for understanding how important this amendment is to myself and many other Members of this Congress.

I also want to thank the Committee on Rules and its chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for allowing me to bring this important amendment before the House today.

This amendment simply requires unspent office funds to be used for deficit or debt reduction. I believe that many Members are now familiar with this common sense amendment that former Congressman Zimmer and I and others first proposed back in 1991.

Before 1995, this amendment was never made in order. In 1995, this amendment was approved on the House floor by an overwhelming margin of 403-21 in 1996, and in 1997, it was accepted on the floor by the committee chairman. In 1998, the committee brought the bill to the House floor with this provision, Mr. Chairman, incorporated into the bill.

Last year, it was accepted on the floor by the committee chairman. I want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), for his efforts on this matter as well. I believe that the Camp-Roemer-Upton-Smith amendment will ensure that Members of Congress can demonstrate their personal commitment to a balanced budget.

This amendment requires any unspent office funds at the end of the year be used for debt reduction, or if a deficit exists, deficit reduction takes priority.

Mr. Chairman, in the last few years, we have achieved, what has eluded Congress for 30 years, a balanced budget. The fiscal year 2001 legislative branch appropriations bill continues our efforts to reduce the national debt and eliminate the national debt and holds a line on spending.

I thank the chairman again for considering the Camp-Roemer-Upton-Smith amendment, and I urge all Members to support the amendment and the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member opposed?

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed, but I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) will control 10 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) from North Carolina and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR) for their support for this amendment.

I want to thank the Committee on Rules as well for allowing us to talk about this important issue, this common sense issue on the floor today. I also join with my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) in offering this amendment. He talked a little bit about the history of this amendment. I will talk a little bit more about that.

We started this crusade back in 1991 to say to the American people that their tax money should go back to the Treasury if Members of Congress work hard, out of their Member's representational allowances, to not spend it, that the taxpayer should be rewarded. We initially met with great resistance in the first couple of years we offered this.

The money instead went into a slush fund that was respent instead of back to the Treasury for debt or deficit reduction. I proudly join in a bipartisan way with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) to follow through on a pledge that we have been trying to pass for almost 8 years.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment for three reasons: One, that the House show leadership on issues of discipline and the budget. If the American people are making sacrifices to get a balanced budget, the House should take the leadership in that role.

The second reason I support this amendment is because when Members, through the course of the year, make decisions not to spend money buying a new photocopier or new computers, that money and their account should be able to go to the Treasury to reduce the debt and not be respent. If Members do the hard work to save money, they and the taxpayer should be rewarded.

The third reason I support this is because debt reduction is the biggest issue for the people throughout this country in this coming election. This will make a small yet important contribution to that debt reduction when Members do take the disciplinary choices forward and save money under their Members representational allowances.

For these three reasons, I think this is a common sense amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. It makes a dent on the national debt; and, therefore, I urge its strong support.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment and thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), again, for offering this cost-saving measure.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to comment on the amendment itself directly, but I simply want to say this: I, for one, take exception to the idea that the greatest public service that we do for people is to refuse to use the little resources we have on behalf of the constituents we represent.

The size of this economy is growing. There are a huge number of power centers in this economy that have one whale of a lot more power than any individual Member of Congress, virtually every lobby group in society has a greater ability to communicate with our own constituents than we do.

□ 1200

I make no apology for the fact that some Members of this institution use all of the resources made available to them under the rules to do their job and most effectively represent the public, and, secondly, to inform the constituents they represent about exactly what is going on out here.

I think that sometimes we see this body leave the impression that somehow we are apologetic about what our offices spend in order to do that job. I try to save every dollar that I can, and I regularly turn some money back to the Treasury. But, to me, when I ran a poll a number of years ago and asked my own constituents whether they wanted less or more communication from us, less or more service, the answer came back they wanted more.

So, frankly, I regard this as one of those "holy picture" amendments that lets Members, very often Members who have the least responsibility and the least impact around this place and who have full reason to turn back a good share of their office budgets, because they make very little contribution to this place and have very little impact on the outcome of the legislative product, they have a good reason to turn back virtually all of their office accounts. But there are a lot of people in this place, in both political parties, who, if anything, need more resources to meet their responsibilities.

We are not asking for those resources, but I do question the conventional wisdom that somehow the greatest public good is served if we all do a mea culpa about the fact we are using our resources to try to see to it that the constituents we represent have the most effective representation possible and that we communicate as much as we can with them.

I also say very frankly that we do no service to our constituents when we squeeze our own Members' office accounts so much that the average Senator can pay \$20,000 more for a legislative assistant than can a Member of the House, when the average Senator can pay \$25,000 more for an administrative assistant or a press secretary than a Member of the House can. We do the same work they do. About the only thing we do not do is ratify treaties, and, thank God, because you look at what a hash they have often made of that.

But it just seems to me that it is about time we recognize we are being advised literally by "kiddy corps" in our offices, because we do not keep people more than 2 or 3 years. You get people who come in at start up levels; and within 2 years, they can make a whale of a lot more money anywhere else than they can on Capitol Hill.

This Congress would be less amateurish, it would be more professional, we would have better oversight, we would have a better legislative product if we had many more experienced staffers than we do.

So I, for one, while this amendment is obviously going to pass, I question the premise behind it, because it seems to me that it allows Members to brag easily for doing something which very often is not in the interest of their constituents.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, we support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue. When I ran for Congress back in 1998, my emphasis was on debt reduction; and it is an important issue because, since 1980, we have gone from approximately \$750 billion in debt to over \$3 trillion in debt and we are spending approximately \$230 billion a year in interest payments on this national debt. It is absurd that we are paying this kind of interest on our national debt.

Now, this amendment does not go a long way to retiring that debt, but it is a symbolic gesture of what we should be doing, and that is practicing fiscal discipline. Last year my office turned over \$50,000 back to the Treasury. If every Member of Congress would do the same thing, then it would go to some extent at least of retiring some of our debt. \$50,000 here and \$50,000 there, sooner or later it adds up to real money; and if we practice fiscal discipline, which I think this amendment is attempting to do, we can get about the business of actually retiring our Nation's debt and serving the people of this Nation in a positive way.

So I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is the right thing to do, not only in terms of policy, but in terms of a symbolic gesture, that we are really committed to retiring our Nation's debt, so we are not spending this God-awful \$230 billion in interest payments on our national debt and interest.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 106-685.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

At the end (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 311. SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY LOCK-BOX.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEDGER.—(1) Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY LOCK-BOX LEDGER

"SEC. 316. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF LEDGER.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the chairman on the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall each maintain a ledger to be known as the 'Spending Accountability Lock-box Ledger'. The Ledger shall be divided into entries corresponding to the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations. Each entry shall consist of three components: the 'House Lock-box Balance'; the 'Senate Lock-box Balance'; and the 'Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance'.

"(b) COMPONENTS OF LEDGER.—Each component in an entry shall consist only of amounts credited to it under subsection (c). No entry of a negative amount shall be made.

"(c) CREDIT OF AMOUNTS TO LEDGER.—(1) In the House of Representatives or the Senate, whenever a Member offers an amendment to an appropriation bill to reduce new budget authority in any account, that Member may state the portion of such reduction that shall be—

"(A) credited to the House or Senate Lock-box Balance, as applicable; or

"(B) used to offset an increase in new budget authority in any other account;

"(C) allowed to remain within the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

If no such statement is made, the amount of reduction in new budget authority resulting from the amendment shall be credited to the House or Senate Lock-box Balance, as applicable, if the amendment is agreed to.

"(2)(A) Except as provided by subparagraph (B), the chairmen of the Committees on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of any appropriation bill by the House of Representatives and upon the engrossment of Senate

amendments to that bill, credit to the applicable entry balance of that House amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by that House to that bill.

“(B) When computing the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by the House of Representatives or the Senate to an appropriation bill, the chairmen of the Committees on the Budget shall only count those portions of such amendments agreed to that were so designated by the Members offering such amendments as amounts to be credited to the House or Senate Lock-box Balance, as applicable, or that fall within the last sentence of paragraph (1).

“(3) The chairmen of the Committees on the Budget shall, upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill, credit to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance the amounts of new budget authority and outlays equal to—

“(A) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of new budget authority in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of new budget authority in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that subcommittee; and

“(B) an amount equal to one-half of the sum of (i) the amount of outlays in the House Lock-box Balance plus (ii) the amount of outlays in the Senate Lock-box Balance for that subcommittee.

“(4) CALCULATION OF LOCK-BOX SAVINGS IN SENATE.—For purposes of calculating under this section the net amounts of reductions in new budget authority and in outlays resulting from amendments agreed to by the Senate on an appropriation bill, the amendments reported to the Senate by its Committee on Appropriations shall be considered to be part of the original text of the bill.

“(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ‘appropriation bill’ means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations through the end of a fiscal year.

“(e) TALLY DURING HOUSE CONSIDERATION.—The chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall maintain a running tally of the amendments adopted reflecting increases and decreases of budget authority in the bill as reported. This tally shall be available to Members in the House of Representatives during consideration of any appropriation bill by the House.”.

(2) The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 315 the following new item:

“Sec. 316. Spending accountability lock-box ledger.”.

(b) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF SECTIONS 302(a) AND (b) ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) ADJUSTMENT OF ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the engrossment of Senate amendments to any appropriation bill (as defined in section 316(d)), the amounts allocated under paragraph (1) to the Committee on Appropriations of each House upon the adoption of the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year shall be adjusted downward by the amounts credited to the applicable Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balance under section 316(c)(2). The revised lev-

els of new budget authority and outlays shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.”.

(2) Section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Whenever an adjustment is made under subsection (a)(6) to an allocation under that subsection, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall make downward adjustments in the most recent suballocations of new budget authority and outlays under this subparagraph to the appropriate subcommittees of that committee in the total amounts of those adjustments under section 316(c)(2). The revised suballocations shall be submitted to each House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of that House and shall be printed in the Congressional Record.”.

(c) PERIODIC REPORTING OF LEDGER STATEMENTS.—Section 308(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such reports shall also include an up-to-date tabulation of the amounts contained in the ledger and each entry established by section 316(a).”.

(d) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENT OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—The discretionary spending limits for new budget authority and outlays set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amounts set forth in the final regular appropriation bill for that fiscal year or joint resolution making continuing appropriations through the end of that fiscal year. Those amounts shall be the sums of the Joint House-Senate Lock-box Balances for that fiscal year, as calculated under section 302(a)(6) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. That bill or joint resolution shall contain the following statement of law: “As required by section 311(d) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001, for fiscal year [insert appropriate fiscal year], the adjusted discretionary spending limit for new budget authority is reduced by \$ [insert appropriate amount of reduction] and the adjusted discretionary limit for outlays is reduced by \$ [insert appropriate amount of reduction] for the fiscal year.”. Section 306 shall not apply to any bill or joint resolution because of such statement. This adjustment shall be reflected in reports under sections 254(f) and 254(g) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section and the amendments made by it shall apply to all appropriation bills making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 or any subsequent fiscal year.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—In the case of any appropriation bill engrossed by the House of Representatives before the date of enactment of this section, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall, within 10 calendar days after that date of enactment, carry out the duties required by the amendments made by this section that occur before that date of enactment.

(3) FY2001 ALLOCATIONS.—The duties of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office and of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives pursuant to this Act and the amendments made by it regarding appropriation bills for fiscal year

2001 shall be based upon the revised section 302(a) allocations in effect upon the date of engrossment of this Act by the House of Representatives.

(4) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term “appropriation bill” means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me just briefly explain what this amendment does. This is the amendment we have often called the appropriations lock box amendment. This is an amendment that has been here before, in the 102nd Congress, the 103rd Congress, the 104th Congress, and the 105th Congress, and passed by voice vote earlier this year. This amendment has been voted on or cosponsored by 328 Members of this body; 328 Members of the minority side and the majority side have already either cosponsored this amendment or voted for this amendment. Yet for some reason today, it is experiencing incredible opposition.

What this amendment does is allow any Member of Congress to come to the floor with an amendment to cut or reduce spending on a given appropriations and use that savings to either dedicate it toward another program or to dedicate it toward debt reduction. It does not hamper us in negotiations with the Senate. The savings is realized after the conference report is passed.

What this does is it says if you want to eliminate spending in the Federal Government and you want to dedicate that spending toward reducing our national debt, you may do so. However, under the crazy rules of the House today, that is not the case. If you come here to the floor and pass an amendment to cut spending, it will be spent somewhere else in the Federal Government. But that is not the will of most Members of Congress. That is not the desire. So what this amendment says is you get the choice, whether your savings will go toward debt reduction or other spending. That is not the case today.

I might add that this has been a bipartisan amendment; it is a bipartisan amendment today. In the 103rd Congress it was considered. In 1994, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and Mr. Zeff introduced a similar law. The President had an executive order in 1994 very similar to this. Congressman CRAPO, the gentleman

from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and former Representative SCHUMER, now a Senator, introduced legislation like this a couple of Congresses ago.

In the 103rd Congress, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), and Congressman Penny introduced similar legislation. More recently, in 1995, the House adopted a very similar piece of legislation to an appropriations bill by a vote of 364 to 59.

Mr. Chairman, this is widely accepted policy. I urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the problem with this amendment is that it reverses the fundamental concept of the 1974 budget process. Rather than have Members of each body arrive at a consensus as to how much we ought to spend on discretionary programs, and then allow the appropriations process to sort out how to deal with competing priorities within that amount, it would call for revision of the discretionary spending limits each time the House disagreed with the Senate over spending priorities.

This would be a unilateral revision in the budget resolution. Once the House began adjusting appropriations bills, the House and Senate would move from identical limits on discretionary spending to different limits. This would mean the House would send conferees to work with the Senate on working out our differences on the individual bills with constraints so tight as to preclude any real prospect of producing legislation that could be sent to the President. The compromise money would be placed in the lock box. The Senate would have the choice of submitting to the House or rejecting a final agreement.

In short, this is a proposal that ought to be supported only by people who believe that we have too few train wrecks in this legislative body.

This sounds good on the surface, but it does not work in practice, which is why the Senate has routinely rejected it. It will again. All it means is this bill will be delayed further because of another conflict on another proposal which will go nowhere.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), and in doing so I would like to add I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin. He is one of the Members who has been consistent on this issue in opposing this policy. I might add that 45 members of our current Committee on Appropriations either cosponsored or voted for this policy.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain to the Members of this House the reason

why we think it is so important to pass this particular amendment.

These are flush times for Washington, D.C. There has been much ado about the record surplus we are expecting and the different ways we are going to spend that surplus. But in our eagerness to out do each other to spend the surplus, we overlook the long-term value of paying down the debt, a debt which is over \$3 trillion, a debt which debt service alone runs \$230 billion a year. We are saddled with that.

That is the purpose behind this amendment, to try to do something, Mr. Chairman, to make certain that when we in fact put forward an amendment to cut spending, that it does just that.

Mr. Chairman, the financial outlook for America may be good, but the past is mired in debt. We have maxed out on the credit card for Uncle Sam; and, frankly, until we pay this debt off, it is shortsighted for us to continue spending without restraint. It is shortsighted for us to claim on the floor that we are making an amendment to cut spending and then find out later that the appropriators have recommitted that spending.

So what this lock box amendment does is to capture all the savings from amendments which reduce or cut funding and to vote to devote the savings to one thing, and that is debt reduction. Under current law, when a Member offers an appropriation amendment that cuts the funding and the House concurs and says yes, this is wasteful Washington spending, the savings is automatically utilized for other discretionary funding. This defeats the whole point of savings.

Furthermore, this lock box will reduce the overall discretionary spending cap by the amount of the savings, to prevent our savings from being spent in the future. This will help Congress prepare for future needs.

Mr. Chairman, the economy is not going to keep this pace forever. We need to find long-term solutions to paying down the debt.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin who offered this amendment in my opinion is one of the rising stars of this House and has spoken a philosophy that I have shared ever since I came to this Congress. But I must say that just passing the bills in the House is only the first step. There are many steps in appropriating for this government. Appropriations must pass through the subcommittees, the full committee, and the House of Representatives.

But then we have the Senate, which is the next activity, and then we have the conference committees between the House and the Senate, and then we have the negotiations between the Congress and the President of the United States; and then, in all of these negotiations, there must be some flexibility.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), a while ago gave an example. Let me repeat that. If the House should reduce a particular airplane program by \$1 billion, and that \$1 billion goes into the lock box; and if the Senate reduces a shipbuilding program, well, the Senate does not reduce shipbuilding programs, let me use another example, some other example in the defense bill by \$1 billion, that is \$2 billion that goes into the lock box. But when you go to conference, there is negotiating in order to get the House and the Senate to come to the same numbers on the same issues.

□ 1215

This amendment, unfortunately, takes away the flexibility that is needed in order to reach these accommodations.

Now, if this were a unicameral legislature, only one House, I would say amen to this amendment without any hesitation, because philosophically, I do agree with this. However, we are not unicameral; we are a bicameral legislature, and we do have to have those negotiations. This amendment, in my opinion, would put the Members of the House at a serious disadvantage with our colleagues in the other body.

Now, when we get to conference, as I said, there must be considerable negotiations, and oftentimes, Members will approach the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or one of our subcommittees and say, well, hey, can you add this for me when you get to conference.

My friend from California said that the appropriators spend the money. Well, let me tell my colleagues who really spends the money here. Our colleagues in this House of Representatives have requested of the Committee on Appropriations, for fiscal year 2000, over 22,000 projects. So the spending is done by Members of the House and Members of the other body, and they have the right to do this. That is why Members are elected to the Congress, to represent their districts, the interests of their districts, or to represent their philosophical viewpoints.

So from a philosophical standpoint, I could not agree more with the gentleman from Wisconsin, but there is a better approach. The gentleman from Pennsylvania earlier this year offered an amendment that I accepted as chairman of the committee, because it set aside a specific amount of appropriated money to go into debt reduction. I am for debt reduction; and I

think it is essential that we reduce the debt as rapidly as we possibly can. That amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was something we could work with. But the pending amendment makes the process very unworkable, and I would hope that the Members would reject it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out to the gentleman from Florida that this amendment also allows Members to come with specific amounts set to debt reduction just like the Toomey amendment does. Also, I think we addressed the bicameral flexibility in this amendment, because it is half of the House, half of the Senate becomes the total of the amount that is passed in the lock box and the conference report.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), a member of the minority party.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I would like to emphasize that the amendment that he is sponsoring today, and I am honored to join with him in cosponsoring, has had a long bipartisan history. I remember Congressman Bill Brewster, Congresswoman Jane Harman, Congressman CHUCK SCHUMER, and many others on this side of the aisle that have championed this cause. I have also worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) on a parallel amendment.

Many of us sit on the Committee on the Budget, and we have struggled with this budget process; and I am sympathetic with the plight in which the folks on the Committee on Appropriations find themselves. But I also, having heard from the previous speaker, realize the enormous pressure that is on the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations process. If we have 22,000 projects that are being requested that are not currently in the budget, it is tempting at every turn to try to accommodate one or another of those projects, if not hundreds of them. And we have had bills at the end of the session for several years running that have been enormous catchall bills, and these bills have been the opportunity for some of us to cause some mischief in the process. If we adopt this lock-box approach, it puts additional structure and discipline in how we deal with our responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the Committee on Appropriations members who are in conference with the Senate. I think those Senators cause us a lot of grief. But I think that if we have something like this lock-box rule that we go into that conference committee with, we can say to those Senators, look, we are going to draw the line. We did something bold in the House. We committed ourselves to deficit reduction,

to using these savings to insulate Social Security and Medicare from any further compromising with respect to the integrity of those programs, because we spend too much.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we join in a bipartisan effort and adopt this lock-box amendment.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those gimmicky amendments that pretends we can deal with some fundamental fiscal problems with a little tinkering with the process. It is based on a very fundamental myth, and that is that somehow over the years, there has not been discipline in discretionary spending. In fact, the history of the Budget Act is that the one part of the budget that has been subject to discipline has been discretionary spending.

The budget process, if it works, sets limits on discretionary spending. The Congress then works within those limits through House, through Senate, through conference committee, through negotiations with the President. That process works when those initial limits are realistic and have some relationship to reality.

To somehow pretend that this is not an ongoing dynamic process with changes as we go through the process from subcommittee to committee, to the House, to the Senate, just flies in the face of reality. It is an ongoing, dynamic process where in the end, our product is what we pass. It should be governed by realistic limits on discretionary spending.

The reason the process has broken down last year, this year, and the year before is that we start with unrealistic discretionary limits so they totally break down, we end up with a catchall at the end, which frankly, in my judgment, results in us spending more than if we had started at realistic discretionary spending limits. Vote no on this gimmick. It does damage; it does no good.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to add that this gimmick has been supported by 328 Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for again toiling in the field of the esoteric budget law; but this is important work, and to respond to the previous speaker, to suggest that there has been some kind of model of physical discipline in discretionary spending in recent years I think is simply to ignore the facts.

The facts are that discretionary spending has been growing at a very

rapid rate, far greater than the speed at which the economy is growing or inflation. I think we clearly need a tool like this for some fiscal discipline. I am happy to note that such a large, overwhelming majority of this body have supported this at one time or another. I am sure Members will want to be consistent in their voting, so I am very hopeful that this will pass.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that all this amendment does is it gives a Member of this body the option to use the savings from an amendment; when he or she reduces a particular account, it creates the option to make sure that that savings actually becomes a savings and does not get spent somewhere else.

Now, if we want to do a transfer amendment, if we want to take from one account and put into another account, we can do that; and this amendment would not change that at all. The flexibility to shift money around from account to account would remain. But today, under our current budget rules, if what we really want to do is reduce spending and not spend it somewhere else, but actually use it to retire some debt and lower the burden on taxpayers in this country, we have no assurance that that will happen, because after we pass the amendment that reduces that account, that money can later be spent somewhere else in the process.

What this amendment does is it gives a Member of this body the option to say, no, I do not want to spend this money anywhere else; I want to see it go for some debt reduction. For that I think it is a very valuable tool, a very important tool; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the sponsor of this amendment and most of the folks who are supporting this voted for a budget that cut less from the national debt and took more time to get to balance than did the Democratic alternative which they voted against.

I serve on the Committee on Appropriations. We have 13 separate appropriation bills. Every Republican chairman as he has reported his bill to the full committee has said, we do not have enough resources to fund the priorities that we have within our responsibility. Every one of the Republican chairmen has said that.

This is not a case where the Committee on Budget has given the Committee on Appropriations so much money it does not know what to do with it. We cut \$3 billion under the President's proposal for education, and 2.7 million children will not be served because of the budget that we passed.

Now, the fact of the matter is, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) talks about bringing down the deficit. I

am for that. I voted for the Balanced Budget Amendment; I voted for the 1997 agreement. I have been a fiscal conservative in the sense that we need to bring down spending. I voted for the 1993 bill, which, in my opinion, has made the most contribution to really bringing down the debt, not nickel and diming by this project or that project, but by hundreds of billions of dollars. That took courage. That is the way we ought to go, not, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) says, by adopting gimmicks that are easy for a lot of people to adopt.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this amendment.

This is not, obviously, the first time this has come up. Mr. Chairman, 238 Members of this institution have supported this amendment in the past and my friend from California (Mr. ROYCE), in fact, was the sponsor of it, I think, in the last Congress.

When we introduce an amendment to an appropriations bill to try to exercise some fiscal responsibility, reduce a line item that we may not particularly support, it is nice to think that after that amendment passes, the money does not disappear into some other program or some other spending item, and that, in fact, can go to debt reduction which I consider to be on equal footing with controlling the size of the budget, providing meaningful tax relief to working Americans, saving Social Security.

These are all important objectives, and it would be nice to be able to pass this amendment and have it in law so that when Members of Congress propose reductions in appropriations, that those reductions do not have to be offset by some other spending increase in some other part of the budget.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his courage in offering this amendment, and I hope that all of the 328 members who have supported this amendment in the past will stand up and do so again. It is good budgeting.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in my last 30 seconds, I would just like to point out that this has been around before. All it does is says, a Member of Congress, if they want to cut spending in an appropriations bill, can dedicate that savings to another bill, to another program that is more valuable, or to pay off the debt. Mr. Chairman, 328 members of this Congress voted for this, 45 appropriators. If a Member wants to find out, if he or she wants to be consistent with their vote when we vote on this, come on down, we have a list right here.

Mr. Chairman, this is scored by the Citizens Against Government Waste, it is scored by the National Taxpayer Union. It is a common sense amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues the practical problems we have with the legislation which we face. Many, many times we have lost \$1 billion in the defense bill, and our defense bill is \$288 billion this year. But when we lose it on the House side, if somebody offered an amendment on one, say it was the F-22 and the Senate had a different figure, we would go into the conference and have a very difficult time resolving it. We would lose our flexibility.

There is no easy way to reduce the deficit. It can only be done with very difficult decisions. In defense, we figure we are \$15 billion to \$20 billion short. So if we took out this kind of money, it would actually affect national defense in a very derogatory way.

□ 1230

So I would hope the Members would understand the importance of this vote. This is absolutely essential to our flexibility in dealing with the other body, so that if something is cut in the House, we can go back and renegotiate and hopefully be able to either restore something or, in the end, get the Department to pay attention to what we are telling them to do.

Last year we cut the F-22. We said we needed more testing. We cut a lot of money out of it. If we had not had this flexibility, this program would have been killed. We would not have had this flexibility.

I would urge the Members to reconsider the vote on this particular amendment. There is no easy way to do it except to vote up or down on these issues. I would urge the Members to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 235, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—184

Aderholt	Barton	Burr
Andrews	Bass	Burton
Archer	Bereuter	Camp
Armey	Berkley	Campbell
Baird	Billbray	Canady
Baker	Bliley	Cannon
Ballenger	Blunt	Castle
Barr	Boehner	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Chambliss
Barrett (WI)	Brady (TX)	Chenoweth-Hage
Bartlett	Bryant	Coble

Coburn	Hooley	Roemer
Collins	Horn	Rogan
Combest	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Condit	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Hunter	Roukema
Crane	Inslee	Royce
Cunningham	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Danner	Jenkins	Ryun (KS)
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Deal	Jones (NC)	Sanford
DeFazio	Kasich	Saxton
DeLay	Kelly	Scarborough
DeMint	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Deutsch	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Doggett	Klecicka	Sessions
Dreier	LaHood	Shadegg
Duncan	Largent	Shaw
Dunn	Lazio	Shays
Ehrlich	Leach	Sherwood
English	Lewis (KY)	Shinkus
Etheridge	Linder	Shows
Everett	LoBiondo	Sisisky
Ewing	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)
Fletcher	Luther	Smith (NJ)
Foley	Maloney (CT)	Smith (TX)
Forbes	Manzullo	Smith (WA)
Fossella	McInnis	Souder
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Stabenow
Gallegly	McIntyre	Stearns
Ganske	Metcalfe	Stump
Gekas	Mica	Sununu
Gibbons	Miller (FL)	Talent
Goode	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Goodlatte	Minge	Tauzin
Goodling	Moore	Taylor (MS)
Goss	Moran (KS)	Terry
Graham	Myrick	Thomas
Granger	Ney	Thornberry
Green (WI)	Norwood	Thune
Gutknecht	Nussle	Toomey
Hall (TX)	Paul	Upton
Hastings (WA)	Pease	Vitter
Hayes	Peterson (MN)	Petri
Hayworth	Pickering	Walden
Hefley	Pitts	Watts (OK)
Herger	Portman	Weldon (FL)
Hill (IN)	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Hill (MT)	Radanovich	Weiler
Hilleary	Ramstad	Weygand
Hoekstra	Riley	Whitfield
Holt		

NOES—235

Abercrombie	Coyne	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Cramer	Hoeffel
Allen	Crowley	Holden
Baca	Cummings	Houghton
Bachus	Davis (FL)	Hoyer
Baldacci	DeGette	Hutchinson
Baldwin	Delahunt	Istook
Barcia	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bateman	Diaz-Balart	Jackson-Lee
Becerra	Dickey	(TX)
Bentsen	Dingell	Jefferson
Berman	Dixon	John
Berry	Dooley	Johnson (CT)
Biggert	Doolittle	Johnson, E. B.
Billrakis	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Bishop	Edwards	Kanjorski
Blagojevich	Ehlers	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Emerson	Kennedy
Boehlert	Eshoo	Kildee
Bonilla	Evans	Kilpatrick
Bonior	Farr	King (NY)
Bono	Fattah	Klink
Borski	Ford	Knollenberg
Boucher	Fowler	Kolbe
Boyd	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Brown (FL)	Frost	Lampson
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Lantos
Buyer	Gephardt	Larson
Callahan	Gilchrest	Latham
Calvert	Gillmor	LaTourette
Capps	Gilman	Lee
Capuano	Gonzalez	Levin
Cardin	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Carson	Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Greenwood	Lipinski
Clayton	Gutierrez	Lofgren
Clement	Hall (OH)	Lowey
Clyburn	Hansen	Lucas (OK)
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Cooksey	Hilliard	Markey
Costello	Hinchey	Martinez

Mascara	Pallone	Spence
Matsui	Pascrell	Spratt
McCarthy (MO)	Pastor	Stark
McCarthy (NY)	Payne	Stenholm
McCrery	Pelosi	Strickland
McDermott	Peterson (PA)	Stupak
McGovern	Phelps	Sweeney
McHugh	Pickett	Tanner
McKeon	Pombo	Tauscher
McKinney	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
McNulty	Porter	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Meek (FL)	Quinn	Thurman
Meeks (NY)	Rahall	Tiahrt
Menendez	Regula	Tierney
Millender-	Reyes	Traficant
McDonald	Reynolds	Turner
Miller, George	Rivers	Udall (CO)
Mink	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
Moakley	Rogers	Velazquez
Mollohan	Rothman	Visclosky
Moran (VA)	Rush	Walsh
Morella	Sabo	Wamp
Murtha	Sanchez	Waters
Nadler	Sanders	Watkins
Napolitano	Sandlin	Watt (NC)
Neal	Sawyer	Waxman
Nethercutt	Schakowsky	Weiner
Northup	Scott	Wexler
Oberstar	Serrano	Wicker
Obey	Sherman	Wilson
Oliver	Shuster	Wise
Ortiz	Simpson	Wolf
Ose	Skeen	Woolsey
Owens	Skelton	Wu
Oxley	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Packard	Snyder	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Cook	Filner	Rangel
Cubin	Hobson	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Hyde	Towns
Dicks	Kuykendall	Vento
Engel	McCollum	Wynn

□ 1253

Mr. DICKEY and Mr. McCRERY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Messrs. BEREUTER, DEUTSCH, HOLT, SUNUNU, CUNNINGHAM, ENGLISH and BAIRD and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 530, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment. If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 50, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 313]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Deal	Jackson-Lee
Ackerman	DeFazio	(TX)
Aderholt	DeGette	Jefferson
Allen	DeLauro	Jenkins
Archer	DeLay	John
Armey	DeMint	Johnson (CT)
Baca	Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Baird	Dickey	Jones (NC)
Baker	Dicks	Jones (OH)
Baldacci	Dixon	Kanjorski
Baldwin	Dooley	Kaptur
Ballenger	Doolittle	Kasich
Barcia	Doyle	Kelly
Barr	Dreier	Kildee
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Barrett (WI)	Dunn	King (NY)
Bartlett	Edwards	Kingston
Barton	Ehlers	Klecza
Bass	Ehrlich	Klink
Bateman	Emerson	Knollenberg
Bentsen	English	Kolbe
Bereuter	Eshoo	Kucinich
Berkley	Etheridge	LaFalce
Berman	Everett	LaHood
Berry	Ewing	Lampson
Biggert	Fletcher	Lantos
Bilbray	Foley	Largent
Bilirakis	Forbes	Larson
Bishop	Fossella	Latham
Blagojevich	Fowler	LaTourette
Bliley	Frank (MA)	Lazio
Blumenauer	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Boehrlert	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Boehner	Ganske	Lewis (GA)
Bonilla	Gekas	Lewis (KY)
Bonior	Gibbons	Linder
Bono	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Borski	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Boswell	Gilman	Lowe
Boucher	Gonzalez	Lucas (OK)
Boyd	Goode	Maloney (CT)
Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)
Brady (TX)	Goodling	Manzullo
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Markey
Bryant	Goss	Martinez
Burr	Graham	Mascara
Burton	Granger	Matsui
Buyer	Green (WI)	McCarthy (MO)
Callahan	Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Gutierrez	McCrery
Camp	Gutknecht	McDermott
Campbell	Hall (OH)	McGovern
Canady	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Cannon	Capps	McInnis
Capuano	Hastert	McIntosh
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Carson	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Castle	Hayes	McKinney
Chabot	Hayworth	McNulty
Chambliss	Hefley	Meehan
Clay	Herger	Meek (FL)
Clayton	Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)
Clement	Hill (MT)	Menendez
Clyburn	Hilleary	Metcalfe
Coble	Hilliard	Mica
Coburn	Hinchey	Millender-
Collins	Hinojosa	McDonald
Combest	Hoefel	Miller (FL)
Condit	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Cooksey	Holden	Mink
Cox	Holt	Moakley
Coyne	Hoolley	Mollohan
Cramer	Horn	Moore
Crane	Hostettler	Morella
Crowley	Houghton	Murtha
Cummings	Hunter	Myrick
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Nadler
Danner	Isakson	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Istook	Neal
Davis (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Nethercutt
		Ney

Northup	Ryun (KS)	Tauzin
Norwood	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Nussle	Salmon	Taylor (NC)
Oberstar	Sanchez	Terry
Obey	Sanders	Thomas
Oliver	Sandlin	Thompson (CA)
Ortiz	Sawyer	Thompson (MS)
Ose	Saxton	Thornberry
Owens	Scarborough	Thune
Oxley	Schakowsky	Thurman
Packard	Scott	Tiahrt
Pallone	Serrano	Tierney
Pascrell	Sessions	Toomey
Pastor	Shadegg	Traficant
Pease	Shaw	Turner
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Udall (CO)
Petri	Sherwood	Udall (NM)
Pickering	Shimkus	Upton
Pickett	Shows	Velazquez
Pitts	Shuster	Visclosky
Pombo	Simpson	Vitter
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Walden
Porter	Skeen	Walsh
Portman	Skelton	Wamp
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Watkins
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Watts (OK)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rahall	Snyder	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Souder	Weller
Regula	Spence	Wexler
Reyes	Spratt	Weygand
Reynolds	Stabenow	Whitfield
Riley	Stearns	Wicker
Rivers	Stenholm	Wilson
Rodriguez	Strickland	Wise
Rogan	Stump	Wolf
Rogers	Stupak	Woolsey
Rohrabacher	Sununu	Wu
Ros-Lehtinen	Sweeney	Young (AK)
Roukema	Talent	Young (FL)
Rush	Tancred	
Ryan (WI)	Tauscher	

NAYS—50

Andrews	Green (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hoyer	Phelps
Brown (OH)	Hulshof	Roemer
Chenoweth-Hage	Inslee	Rothman
Conyers	Kennedy	Royce
Costello	Kind (WI)	Sanford
Davis (FL)	Lee	Schaffer
Delahunt	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Lucas (KY)	Shays
Doggett	Luther	Smith (WA)
Evans	Miller, George	Stark
Farr	Minge	Tanner
Fattah	Moran (KS)	Towns
Ford	Moran (VA)	Waters
Frost	Paul	Watt (NC)
Gejdenson	Payne	Waxman
Gephardt	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—12

Cook	Hobson	Rangel
Cubin	Hyde	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Kuykendall	Vento
Filner	McCollum	Wynn

□ 1310

Messrs. FARR of California, MINGE, PETERSON of Minnesota, SHAYS and TOWNS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present during rollcall votes 311, 312, and 313. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 311, “no” on rollcall vote 312, and “yea” on rollcall vote 313.